

DTIC FILE COPY

2

AD-A230 507



HISTORY AND ANALYSIS OF GROWTH IMPACTS
IN THE FORT DRUM REGION
1984 - 1990

DTIC
ELECTE
DEC 20 1990
S B D
Co

Prepared By:
Economics Research Associates
& Rhodeside & Harwell, Inc

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE Sep 1990	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED History 1984-1990	
A. TITLE AND SUBTITLE History and Analysis of Growth Impacts in The Fort Drum Region 1984-1990			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) (not available)				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Economic Research Associates & Rhodeside & Harwell, Inc 20 E. Jackson St Chicago, Illinois 60604			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NONE	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Office of Economic Adjustment Room 4C767 Pentagon Washington, DC 20301-4000			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NONE	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Has been distributed to governmental and non-profit planning entities in communities surrounding Fort Drum, NY.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release, Distribution is Unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) History and analysis of the growth impacts resulting from the construction at Fort Drum, NY 194-1990. In creating a new base for the 10th Mountain Light Infantry Division, the Army undertook the largest military construction project since World War II. This history details how the neighboring three county areas adjusted to the rapid build-up, the population increase, and the need for additional services and infrastructure.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS History Economic Adjustment Fort Drum, NY			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 265	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

The Report Documentation Page (RDP) is used in announcing and cataloging reports. It is important that this information be consistent with the rest of the report, particularly the cover and title page. Instructions for filling in each block of the form follow. It is important to *stay within the lines* to meet optical scanning requirements.

Block 1. Agency Use Only (Leave blank).

Block 2. Report Date. Full publication date including day, month, and year, if available (e.g. 1 Jan 88). Must cite at least the year.

Block 3. Type of Report and Dates Covered. State whether report is interim, final, etc. If applicable, enter inclusive report dates (e.g. 10 Jun 87 - 30 Jun 88).

Block 4. Title and Subtitle. A title is taken from the part of the report that provides the most meaningful and complete information. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number, and include subtitle for the specific volume. On classified documents enter the title classification in parentheses.

Block 5. Funding Numbers. To include contract and grant numbers; may include program element number(s), project number(s), task number(s), and work unit number(s). Use the following labels:

C - Contract	PR - Project
G - Grant	TA - Task
PE - Program Element	WU - Work Unit Accession No.

Block 6. Author(s). Name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. If editor or compiler, this should follow the name(s).

Block 7. Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 8. Performing Organization Report Number. Enter the unique alphanumeric report number(s) assigned by the organization performing the report.

Block 9. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 10. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Report Number. (If known)

Block 11. Supplementary Notes. Enter information not included elsewhere such as: Prepared in cooperation with...; Trans. of...; To be published in... When a report is revised, include a statement whether the new report supersedes or supplements the older report.

Block 12a. Distribution/Availability Statement. Denotes public availability or limitations. Cite any availability to the public. Enter additional limitations or special markings in all capitals (e.g. NOFORN, REL, ITAR).

DOD - See DoDD 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."
DOE - See authorities.
NASA - See Handbook NHB 2200.2.
NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 12b. Distribution Code.

DOD - Leave blank.
DOE - Enter DOE distribution categories from the Standard Distribution for Unclassified Scientific and Technical Reports.
NASA - Leave blank.
NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 13. Abstract. Include a brief (*Maximum 200 words*) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report.

Block 14. Subject Terms. Keywords or phrases identifying major subjects in the report.

Block 15. Number of Pages. Enter the total number of pages.

Block 16. Price Code. Enter appropriate price code (*NTIS only*).

Blocks 17. - 19. Security Classifications. Self-explanatory. Enter U.S. Security Classification in accordance with U.S. Security Regulations (i.e., UNCLASSIFIED). If form contains classified information, stamp classification on the top and bottom of the page.

Block 20. Limitation of Abstract. This block must be completed to assign a limitation to the abstract. Enter either UL (unlimited) or SAR (same as report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited. If blank, the abstract is assumed to be unlimited.

FORT DRUM STEERING COUNCIL

CHAIRMAN

CARY R. BRICK

CLIFFORD C. REINHARD (EMERITUS)

VICE-CHAIRMAN

BETTY BRADLEY WESLEY EISENHAUER THOMAS McCUE T. URLING WALKER

SECRETARY/TREASURER

JAMES WRIGHT

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
(COUNCIL OFFICERS PLUS)

EDWARD COSMIC JAMES COX STEPHEN HARTER JOHN JOHNSON, JR.

STEERING COUNCIL MEMBERS

KARL AMYLON
BRUCE ARMSTRONG
JUDITH FOSTER
MARK FREEMAN
JANE JENKINS
DONALD JEWETT

THOMAS JEWETT
JOHN KIECHLE
LLOYD MOORE
JOHN MORGIA
EUGENE MUNROE
RICHARD NELLS

HERMAN ZAHN, JR.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHAPTER I

A. Background

In the winter of 1984, the Army began discussion in Congress concerning the potential of establishing a new light infantry division. Within approximately one month, the commander at Ft. Drum, New York was notified that there could be a potential role for the facility in accommodating the light infantry division. This announcement kicked off a flurry of activity in the North Country area of New York, around Ft. Drum, with Representative David O'B. Martin leading the charge through private meetings and conversations with White House, the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, and the Army Chief of Staff to stress the strategic and military advantages of Ft. Drum and the long history of military presence and acceptance in northern New York. The full New York State congressional delegation was also briefed by Rep. Martin, and the delegation voted to support the securing of the division at Ft. Drum. This process included an environmental impact statement hearing held by the Army Corps of Engineers.

The community mobilized behind the objective of securing the light infantry division at Ft. Drum, and began to see the opportunities that it would create for the area. In the fall, in a letter to the Secretary of Defense, Governor Cuomo provided details concerning the type of state assistance New York would pledge to support the light infantry division. In September, the Department of Defense formally accepted the Army's plans to create the new division and on September 11, Rep. Martin announced that the efforts had been successful. November 16, 1984, the Secretary formally confirmed that Ft. Drum had been selected for the stationing of the new active division.

The eighty-year history of Ft. Drum was one of many ups and downs. Activity at the post, which was opened in 1908, ebbed and flowed. There were times of military build-ups, which brought in additional soldiers and created growth and opportunity for the surrounding community. The opposite occurred during the down periods. For a number of years prior to the announcement, the post had essentially become "fallow." Because the economy of the North Country was declining, the military down-turns left the North Country particularly vulnerable to and skeptical about new ideas for the post. Prior to 1984, many years of efforts had been invested by political representatives to put the post to more active use. These led to some successes, including the construction of some family housing units and the stationing of a permanent party of engineers, but proposals for more intense use of Ft. Drum bore limited fruit.

Thus, it was a somewhat skeptical community which heard the announcement concerning the new light infantry division, the 10th Mountain Division. The years of disappointment had given the community a "show me" attitude. (This gave a psychological buffer against further disappointments should things fall through.) The community was not in the least prepared for the rapid build-up that was about to occur; the need for the Ft. Drum community in late 1984 was one of a coordinated, co-operative effort. It thus required a Herculean effort to pull together all the pro-active elements of planning and impact mitigation to insure that both the Army's build-up could be accommodated in the Watertown region, as well as other expected influx.

The history that is included in this report details the organization, the management, the implementation, and the funding approaches that the North Country community employed to deal with the massive build-up. During the five year period between 1985

and 1989, there were over 10,000 new soldiers transferred into Ft. Drum. Along with them came their families and dependents, as well as several thousand others who migrated to the area to capitalize on job and investment opportunities.

The following sections discuss the Army perspective, the overview of the historic detail, the community response which was implemented by the Ft. Drum Steering Council and its task forces, community accomplishments, and the on-going activity.

B. The Army Perspective and Ft. Drum Build-up

The history of the construction and staffing of the new Ft. Drum and the build-up of the 10th Mountain Division is as significant and interesting as the story of the community response to the growth impacts that flowed from it. It is the build-up which created the basis for community response, just as many years of community initiatives helped bring about the selection of Ft. Drum as the new home for the 10th Mountain Division.

The prepared history will present a limited view of the Army's experience with the build-up and the construction program since they are documented elsewhere. Major build-up construction activities are highlighted as entries on the time line covering on-post activities, and in the community subsequent to 1984. (See Appendix). Activities on-post demanded a great deal of energy and attention from the military leadership and from the Department of the Army civilian managers. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had a major role in the real estate and development facets as well. Management from contracting and sub-contracting firms was also key.

Many of these concerns did not require interaction with the Steering Council. However, the build-up did create important needs

and expectations at the Fort involving input, assistance and participation from the Steering Council and from other community groups. Those needs and expectations and the ways in which the Council and community responded to them will be described in the appropriate chapters of this document; for example, in the chapters dealing with housing and human service issues.

The Organization and Functions Manual issued through the Directorate of Resource Management at Ft. Drum lists some 48 major missions for Ft. Drum and for the 10th Mountain Division. These missions cover a full range of garrison division responsibilities. Division responsibilities include the whole range of functions necessary to maintain a Light Infantry Division manned and trained to deploy rapidly by air, sea and land anywhere in the world, prepared to fight on arrival and to win. Garrison responsibilities include, as examples, general administration, facilities maintenance, planning and implementing new construction, managing a large staff of civilian employees, and handling large scale logistics and transportation functions. In addition, Ft. Drum is responsible for providing training, administration, and logistics facilities and support for U.S. Army Reserve, Army National Guard Units, Reserve Officers' Training Corps activities within its assigned geographic area. All of these responsibilities were intensified by being accomplished against the backdrop of building a brand new Army division and the development and large scale redevelopment of the new Ft. Drum in an accelerated time frame.

As if the foregoing set of responsibilities were not enough for any single team of military officers and managers, leadership at the fort also recognized that it was necessary to be a good governmental and corporate citizen of the communities around it. During the eight-month study period which produced this report, no evidence has been brought forward to suggest that leadership at the fort was at any time unappreciative of, or insensitive to the

magnitude of the impact the build-up was having on communities in the impact area.

While the Steering Council was not closely involved with the mechanics of the build-up on post, it is also fair to say that the council, its members, and its task forces were both aware of and interested in progress at the fort. The Army made ample provision for community participation and for Steering Council representation at ceremonies marking major stages of construction and the activation of major military units. Throughout the build-up, the Council had a healthy awareness that the Army and its military and civilian managers had many jobs to do, and that only certain of those jobs required community input or assistance.

It was the joint, co-operative effort between the Army and the community leaders that enabled the Ft. Drum build-up to progress as smoothly as it did. Because the Army provided specialists and expertise on most of the Steering Council task forces, it can be said that the military also had an active role in community affairs, in addition to its own responsibilities.

C. History Highlights

Prior to the formal announcement that Ft. Drum was the official selection by the Secretary of the Army, there were a number of activities which commenced or were undertaken to begin the preparations for possible growth. These included the completion of an environmental impact statement, the resolution to form a Steering Council to provide oversight and direction, the formation of the Drum Area Council of Governments, and a public meeting to begin dealing with the early issues surrounding use of the Army's 801 Housing program. Highlights of the build-up history are bulleted below in a quick summary fashion.

- December 1984 - The first request for proposal for 801 Housing development was issued by the Norfolk District, Army Corps of Engineers. The New York State Division for Housing and Community Renewal opened a regional Watertown office and Governor Cuomo formed his own task force on Ft. Drum which was charged to find ways to assist the Ft. Drum expansion.
- January 1985 - Structural Associates of Syracuse was chosen to carry out the first phase of renovation of existing Drum facilities for interim use.
- March 1985 - The Steering Council Executive Committee members support a concept to establish a regional Development Authority to handle water, sewage, solid waste, and economic development.
- April 1985 - The Ft. Drum Land Use Team was formed with funds provided by the New York State Department of State.
- June 1985 - Enabling legislation for the Development Authority of the North Country underwent continuing revisions, and was passed by the legislature. Governor Cuomo came to Watertown to sign the bill.
- June 1985 - A \$125,000 funding commitment for the Steering Council was announced, and representatives from the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) were on hand to expedite the funding. Jefferson County was selected to receive the OEA funds.
- July 1985 - The Corps of Engineers advertised requests for qualifications for engineers and architects to complete approximately \$500 million in new construction at Drum.
- August 1985 - The first 801 Housing contracts were awarded.
- Fall 1985 - Special state legislation was enacted to assist schools experiencing rapid military-related student growth: \$12 million resulted.
- December 1985 - A pre-proposal conference for on-post housing construction was held to discuss a total of 800 planned units. The Corps of Engineers announced that \$250 million in construction contracts would be awarded in early 1986.
- January 1986 - Public transportation (CENTRO) study began.

- February 1986 - The first fiscal impact analysis by the Office of Economic Adjustment was completed.
- March 1986 - The first New York State Housing Finance Agency Housing Market Analysis began.
- Spring 1986 - Construction on first increment of 1,400 units of the 801 Housing projects began.
- May 1986 - The payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT) agreements were reached between some of the communities and the developers of 801 Housing projects in those communities.
- June 1986 - A contract for the collection and disposal of sewage was signed between the Army and the Development Authority of the North Country.
- September 1986 - The CHAMPUS demonstration project was implemented, providing direct medical payments for Fort Drum military personnel and family members who were required to purchase off-post medical services.
- October 1986 - Architectural and planning layouts were prepared for the post.
- Winter 1986 - SUNY-Ft. Drum-North Country consortium of colleges was established to provide bachelor's and master's degree programs locally.
- January 1987 - The Ft. Drum Steering Council developed and released the housing master plan, and the public transportation study was completed by CENTRO. As well, a study by the State of New York's Housing Finance Agency indicated that despite the anticipated housing production, a gap of both rental and for-sale units would exist.
- February 1987 - The Updated Fiscal Impact Analysis for Ft. Drum was released by the Steering Council. This provided an overview of immigration, education needs, and housing implications.
- March 1987 - The Steering Council was told by the Army that announcement for the selection of contractors for an on-post hotel and residential units was pending.
- March 1987 - 300 additional units of 801 Housing were contracted for with the Gates-Rinaldi Corporation for the Town of LeRay.

- May 1987 - The state legislature granted an award of \$60,000 to the Steering Council for emergency medical service training, and another \$60,000 to the Development Authority for fire service equipment.
- August 1987 - The local highway study began, financed by the Steering Council.
- Fall 1987 - A memorandum of agreement between Ft. Drum and civilian law enforcement agencies delineated prospective responsibilities. This inter-agency law enforcement agreement was one of the major success stories of the build-up.
- October 1987 - Ft. Drum began pumping its sewage through the completed DANC pipeline to the Watertown sewage plant.
- November 1987 - The Public Safety Master Plan Study began.
- December 1987 - The First Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic (MAST) flight was completed. Controversy erupted over the fire safety standards governing the hospital's helipad.
- September 1987 - The Ft. Drum Steering Council, Development Authority of the North Country, and Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation jointly formed the North Country Affordable Housing Corporation, a non-profit housing corporation to provide low- and moderate-income housing.
- February 1988 - The Buffalo regional office of HUD, in response to a request from the Steering Council, sent representatives to Watertown to assist municipalities in preparing applications for Small Cities' Community Development Block Grants.
- May 1988 - The fourth and final 801 Housing award was made.
- November 1988 - The Local Government Study began to evaluate how local governments are organized and managed to deal with the larger populations and issues brought about by the military expansion. That same month, the first on-post housing development was completed.
- February 1989 - The Public Safety Master Plan was completed.

Some of the activities and studies that were begun by the Steering Council prior to the end of 1989 were completed in early 1990, and there is on-going work with respect to 801 Housing development and on-post development activities. A great many more specific events occurred during the five-year period that was evaluated. The details of these are shown by date and month in the Appendix.

D. The Ft. Drum Steering Council and Its Task Forces

The structure and organization of the Ft. Drum Steering Council was a key concept and factor in the way that the community dealt with the massive military build-up at Ft. Drum. At the outset, Congressman David O'B. Martin requested assistance from the Department of Defense in setting up an appropriate organization. One of the representatives from the DOD, Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) worked with the community to structure this organization. As well, OEA provided \$75,000 in seed money to initiate the process. With this input, the local community developed a proposed structure for its Steering Council, and under existing law, OEA approved it. The Steering Council was established by a joint resolution between Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties -- the three counties which were to be impacted by the Ft. Drum build-up. Under Article 12-C of the Municipal Law of New York, an inter-governmental relations council resulted.

The main objective of this inter-governmental relations council was to strengthen the local government ability to promote efficient and economic government services within the participating municipalities. Legal powers were passed on to the Steering Council giving it the capability of conducting business that was

necessary to provide oversight, co-operation, and coordination as the military-community programming began.

Specifics of the objectives of the Steering Council are as follows:

- a. To expand the tax post throughout the impact area, and spread the growth as well as share the accompanying impacts.
- b. To develop infrastructure throughout the impact area to allow existing communities to grow.
- c. To integrate the military and their families into the community as they arrived.
- d. To view Ft. Drum expansion as a spring board for future economic development, by ensuring that the decisions made during the planning process did not preclude future flexibility.
- e. To help local governments accept and acknowledge the cost of the build-up. To encourage local government entities and existing organizations to expand their capabilities to deal with the new situation after the Steering Council was dissolved.

The task and challenge facing the Steering Council in late 1984 was substantial. Only a few of the towns and villages within the impact area had zoning or planning capability at that time. Because a key objective of the council was to manage the tremendous rapid growth, necessary steps were taken to enable the local communities to develop the capacity to deal with the impacts. Very important in the overall challenge was the manner in which the Council served as a sounding board for the Army, keeping the general public informed as to changes and their implications. The Council can be largely credited with the fact that the local governments overcame the historic inertia which had existed for several decades in the North Country. The members were pro-active, looking to identify and find solutions to problems before they raged out of control.

Because the Steering Council was established by a joint resolution of the counties, initially its membership was comprised of key public-sector leaders. However, the Council went through several iterations, in which new members were added, giving the group a broader community/political post and better credibility in the region. Ultimately membership was comprised largely of political leaders from the counties and city. However, four at-large members rounded out the group. Ex-officio members were the Congressman from the local district, the Governor of the State, the State Senator from the local district, assemblymen from the 112th and 114th Assembly Districts, and commander of Fort Drum.

To carry out the basic charter of the Steering Council, which was to foster co-ordination and joint planning among the tri-county communities, the Council hired technical staff to be responsible for specific tasks. Over the years, two executive directors interfaced between the community and the military and were complemented with staff who had skills in planning, economic development, management and forecasting/modeling.

Specific tasks that the Council was empowered to perform included the following:

1. Create an inventory of resources to identify assets that should be better utilized.
2. Forecast the impact of the expansion that was outlined in the environmental impact statement.
3. Meld the various public agency staffs to produce cohesive plans.
4. Solicit support and financing from state, federal, and local sources.
5. Coordinate and implement these plans.

The Council was provided extensive input from the local task forces which polled over 600 local leaders and technicians who brought ideas and solutions to the challenges facing the community and the Steering Council.

The structure and the legal capabilities of the Steering Council enabled it to accomplish a great deal in developing an effective, comprehensive local development strategy. The organization and the direction of the 14 task forces enabled the community, via the Steering Council, to deal with the massive build-up and the community growth. The positive position that the Steering Council assumed vis-a-vis the benefits of the Drum build-up enabled them to maintain the positive community support for the changes underway. Via the media, the general public was kept informed of expansion activities.

Some of the specific accomplishments of the Steering Council include the preparation of a fiscal impact analysis, which was published in a first-cut analysis of the expected impacts and subsequently updated and refined as time went on. The Council also managed several studies that were needed to augment local planning efforts. These included a study of mass transit needs in the impact area, a Public Safety Master Plan, several housing market analyses, a local Highway impact Analysis, a local Government Management Study, and this history and analysis of the growth.

In addition to developing the foundation materials for strategic planning, the Council also took a pro-active position in implementing the recommendations. Key activities in which the Council participated included:

1. The implementation of a housing master plan;
2. Funding and participation in joint planning for the delivery of health care services by the six hospitals in the region;

3. Planning and coordination for the formation of the Ft. Drum Land Use Team;
4. Creation of the Development Authority of the North Country;
5. Implementation of the MAST program;
6. Co-sponsorship of a procurement conference for more than 700 local businesses;
7. Creation of the North Country Affordable Housing, Inc., which is responsible for developing affordable housing units;
8. Legislation for regulatory changes in the New York State Housing Trust Fund and a \$12 million Affordable Housing Fund through DANC; and
9. Generation of a \$60,000 grant for emergency medical services.

A short description of each of the task forces is below. We have defined their key objectives and accomplishments.

Agricultural Task Force

The task force members were concerned about the development and expansion impacts on agricultural land uses in the North Country. Their goal was to expand the market potential for agricultural products generated by the post and civilian growth. This group participated in the development of the Regional Land Use Plan, sponsored a farm product marketing workshop, and developed a pamphlet concerning selling products to the military.

Economic Growth and Development

The key objectives of this task force were to reduce long-term unemployment in the impact area, encourage business development opportunities to attract and retain younger and more entrepreneurial people, and encourage and assist with the revitalization of existing industries to pursue a multi-faceted economic post. The task force created a Small Business Development Center, assisted local businesses as they pursued contracts by sponsoring a Defense Procurement Conference, underwrote and supported the creation of the Development Authority of the North Country, which would serve as the lead agency in promoting economic development, and supported activities of existing municipal entities as they pursued their own economic development objectives.

Education Task Force

The objective of this task force was to ensure the delivery of quality educational opportunities to both students and community members in an economic and efficient manner. The task force achieved these objectives through several key accomplishments. Some of these included surveying school district's related health needs, initiating multi-cultural awareness workshops, securing more than \$12 million in funding from New York State, monitoring of monthly school enrollment figures, serving as a liaison with the State Education Department, and supporting the development of the SUNY-Ft. Drum-North Country Consortium of Colleges.

Employment Opportunities Task Force

The objective here was to enhance employment prospects for local residents through a coordinated referral mechanism. By using existing mechanisms, the group was able to develop and distribute a brochure to promote local services such as employment training and job services. It sponsored and implemented through the New York State Department of Labor a tri-county employment network system, and developed an application system to match job seekers with employer needs.

Health Care Task Force

The task force directed its activities toward evaluating the impact of Ft. Drum on the area's health care needs, and identifying approaches to meet these needs. Three subcommittees were established: The Community Health Services Committee; The Medical Subcommittee; and The Hospital Subcommittee. Through these groups, a census of area physicians was developed and specific gaps were identified in the provision of medical services to aid in determining recruitment objectives. Specific hospital service needs requirements were identified; existing agencies were surveyed to provide a post line of health services information and plan for expansion; a dental clinic was established at Mercy Hospital; the CHAMPUS Demonstration Project was developed; and credential privileges were granted for Army physicians to practice in local hospitals.

History Task Force

The history task force developed a list of notable civilian and military personnel. These were presented to the Division Commander for possible use in naming new buildings, streets, and areas in the new cantonment area.

Housing Task Force

The task force directed its activities toward equalizing demand and supply of housing in the impact area by promoting new construction and renovating existing units. This group stayed abreast of trends in displacement, mobility, and rent/value increases, and prepared a housing master plan. Through their request, the New York State Housing Finance Agency prepared a housing market analysis, which in turn, enabled the task force to position the North Country for priority consideration in receiving federal and state government program aid. Shelter allowance increases were promoted by the task force, as was a raise in Section 8 income levels through that program. The members were able to maintain an accurate picture of the housing market characteristics and refine the master planning as time went on.

801 Housing Task Force

The aim of this task force was to develop a fair and equitable revenue stream to local municipalities which provide public services to residents. The focus of this group was to ensure that the 801 Housing Units being built in the local communities would pay a fair share tax burden. The major accomplishment was developing guidelines and policies relating to the structure of Payment In Lieu Of Tax (PILOT) agreement and the communities.

Human Services Task Force

The first objective of this group was to ensure that the human service delivery problems caused by the Ft. Drum growth could be dealt with, and affected agencies could continue to provide an adequate level of service. Subcommittees were formed on Youth, Child Care, Housing, Information and Referral, Family Violence, Transient Management, Crisis Intervention. The key successes of this group were the development of an inventory of human services and the provision of a framework for networking and information sharing. Projects implemented included a Transient Management Plan, and the coordination with Ft. Drum and the Jefferson County Council of Social Agencies to increase cultural awareness. They also established a child care referral system, an approach to identification of child need, and an expansion of the family counselling program for both military and non-military families.

Land Use Task Force

The professionals on this group identified the impact on land use created by the expansion of Ft. Drum and provided technical assistance to other planners in the tri-county area. Specifically, the task force identified the shortfall in staff resources, which led to the formation of Ft. Drum Land Use Team, which worked to provide planning services to communities in the area. The group also assisted OEA in identifying and rating community capacity to accommodate new development and in providing input into the population distribution model. The Land Use Task Force generated regional land use policies for adoption by the Steering Council.

Modeling Task Force

The goal here was to analyze and forecast demographic and fiscal growth impacts in the North Country area. Working with the Steering Council and its staff, the Modeling Task Force updated the fiscal impact analysis, collected data on trends in the area to facilitate the preparation of an updated, regional profile and characterization. Fiscal impact spreadsheets and a monitoring system for employment and construction were also a part of the input for the FIA model. The final output forecast school district enrollment, population spread, and municipal fiscal impacts.

Public Safety Task Force

This group targeted its activity toward identifying potential public safety problems and seeking solutions or strategies to eliminate or reduce these. As well, the task force provided a forum between civilian and military agencies to ensure that this occurred. Major accomplishments were a comprehensive study of public safety organizations, the negotiation of a Memorandum of Agreement between the civilian and military law enforcement jurisdictions, implementation of the Military Assistance To Safety And Traffic (MAST) program, and the generation of a \$60,000 state legislative grant to respond to emergency medical services needs. This task force was also active in planning for adoption of E-911 emergency telephone service in each of the three impacted counties.

Solid Waste Task Force

The intent of this group was to identify management strategies for solid waste disposal problems that resulted from both the expansion as well as existing needs. The members of this group studied the various issues, commissioned two reports to identify the feasibility of alternative proposals, and recommended a preferred alternative for managing solid waste disposal needs in the region.

Transportation Task Force

The objectives of the task force were to assess and identify the transportation impacts created through regional expansion, and to formulate a prioritized response and strategy to implement solutions for negative impacts. Work tasks revolved around finding solutions to maximize the use and efficiency of existing networks. This task force implemented a multi-year consultant study of local highway needs, developed a proposal to create a limited access highway between the interstate and Ft. Drum, studied mass transit needs, and assisted the New York State Department of Transportation in prioritizing state highway improvement projects in the area.

E. Community Accomplishments

Some of the community accomplishments have already been discussed in the above description of the task forces, their objectives and accomplishments. Secondary or spin-off accomplishments are highlighted here. These include the following.

The Development Authority of the North Country constructed a 12-mile pipeline, which carries sewage from Ft. Drum to the City

of Watertown's sewage treatment facility, and will construct and operate a parallel waterline. This infrastructure has enabled communities which border along the 12-mile corridor to participate in the economic growth in the North Country and expand their tax post. Through DANC's efforts, a multi-faceted economic development strategic plan has been prepared and the vast majority of the program recommendations are currently being implemented.

The inventory and cataloging of health and human service facilities and programs prioritized the needs and gaps in services throughout the impact area. Specific program changes are improving the services, and through a cooperative effort between Jefferson County and local not-for-profit organizations, an emergency shelter program for displaced families has been developed.

Mentioned above was the Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic (MAST) program. This effort makes 10th Mountain Division helicopters available to the civilian community for emergency ambulance service to critically ill or injured patients. During the first two months of its operations, it was instrumental in saving three lives which would have otherwise been lost. More than 75 accident victims have been transported via the MAST program for medical treatment.

The Steering Council, through its public safety task force, completed a comprehensive area-wide public safety master plan. The plan identifies gross requirements in all sectors of public safety -- police, fire, emergency medical services, emergency management, the court systems, and probation. The plan provides a blueprint to local governments for the provision of services to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population.

Education has seen real accomplishments and strides. The Council sponsored the establishment of a consortium of eight

colleges from the New York State university system to provide undergraduate and graduate programs in the impact area. The state and federally funded Small Business Development Center at Jefferson Community College has helped a number of local firms in doing business with the military and federal government, specifically, with the large contractors working at Ft. Drum.

Housing has been a main concern of the Steering Council and the community at large. With input from the Council, the private sector and local/state/federal governments have achieved multifaceted solutions to housing issues. For example, last year 12 communities in the impact area were awarded nearly \$7 million in HUD Small Cities Community Development Block Grants and Farmers' Home Administration Community Facility Funds. These monies will enable them to build infrastructure necessary for the construction of affordable housing. During the last five years, 27 awards totaling over \$13 million have been received by local government entities.

The Ft. Drum Steering Council successfully promoted legislation which now enables the community to access the \$100 million dollar New York State Housing Trust Fund for new construction of rental housing. As well, local efforts initiated State legislation which resulted in the establishment of a \$12 million set-aside to the Development Authority of the North Country for construction of affordable housing.

The formation of a not-for-profit housing corporation has enabled the area to apply for and receive more than \$17 million from New York State Housing Programs which will result in 424 new, affordable dwelling units and the rehabilitation of 30 additional units.

The federal government's 801 Housing Program was part of the solution to house military families. These new developments created infrastructure requirements in the communities where they were built. To provide a cash stream to the local governments, the Steering Council assisted in the development of Payment In Lieu Of Taxes (PILOT) agreements between four housing developers and nine communities. This resulted in the construction of 2,000 units of 801 Housing. From the very beginning, the development of new housing was considered the pacing factor for the build-up at Ft. Drum. The completion of these units enabled the 10th Mountain Division to locate at Ft. Drum on schedule.

For the last six years, the North Country communities and citizens have been in a race to keep abreast with the activation plans of the United States Army. Under the auspices of the Ft. Drum Steering Council, this has been accomplished. Involvement of federal agencies spearheaded by the Office of Economic Adjustment got the community started and New York State, through the governor's Task Force On Ft. Drum, provided much of the impetus along the way. Yet, it is clear that the overwhelming success came about through a sound management and oversight body as well as thousands of hours of volunteer effort from citizens in the community.

F. Follow-on

Throughout the course of the preparation of this history and assessment, the need for an on-going organization has been discussed. Currently, the Steering Council is forming a regional liaison organization to serve as a prime point of contact between the military establishment and the government's institutions and people of the tri-county impact area. This will be a broad-based group of local leaders who will ensure that the lines of communication between the military and civilian communities established by the Steering Council will remain open, and that the open dialogue and cooperation will continue.

CHAPTER II

FORT DRUM STEERING COUNCIL

A. Organization and Function of Fort Drum Steering Council

The history of the Fort Drum Steering Council goes back to the announcement of the activation of the 10th Mountain Division. Community leaders, including local as well as state representatives, determined that they would need an organization to coordinate and manage the community response to the influx of several thousand military people and their families, plus the simultaneous growth in the community of people who migrate into the area, attracted by the potential for business start-up or job opportunities related to the post.

Congressman David O'B. Martin requested assistance from the Department of Defense in establishing this type of organization. The Department of Defense assigned its Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) to work with the community in structuring and organizing for growth. The OEA staff person, Paul Sage, met with a core group of community leadership to discuss alternative organizational structures for consideration and the issues associated with each one of them. At that time, OEA provided \$75,000 in seed money to initiate this process. These dollars were used to hire the first executive director of what was then called the Tri-County Steering Council. David Hannum, who was the former post commander at Fort Drum, was selected to serve in this capacity. OEA recommended that the Fort Drum Steering Council be structured around a model in which the council was a core leadership group, and a number of task force spokes were set up to respond to a variety of needs and issues.

The local community developed a proposed structure for the Steering Council, and the Office of Economic Adjustment agreed to the structure under the guidelines of the Defense Authorization Act 10 USC 2391. This new organization was identified by the governor as the single point of contact for decision making and coordination between the state, federal and local agencies involved in the buildup.

The Steering Council was established by a joint resolution of Jefferson, Lewis and St. Lawrence counties -- the three counties likely to be impacted by the Ft. Drum buildup -- as an inter-governmental relations council under the provisions of article 12-C of the General Municipal Law of New York State. Jefferson County was selected as the lead in this process, and helped format the structure and the by-laws for the organization. Initially, the proposed membership of the council was limited to about ten people.

Almost immediately, The Jefferson County Board of Supervisors felt the need for a broader post of representation from the tri-county area and the communities which were to be impacted. After considerable debate, the membership of the Steering Council was expanded to 21 active and 6 ex-officio members. Membership included the Chairmen of the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors, the Lewis County Legislative Board and the St. Lawrence County Board of Legislators; Chairman of the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors Planning Committee; Supervisors from the Towns of Antwerp, Champion, LeRay, Pamelaia, Philadelphia, Rutland, Theresa and Wilna; Clerk of the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors; Director of the Jefferson County Planning Department; Jefferson County Treasurer; Mayor and City Manager of the City of Watertown and four at-large members (residents of Jefferson County) to be appointed by the Chairman of the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors. (Original appointees were Cary Brick - Administrative

Assistant/Staff Director for Congressman David O'B. Martin, John Johnson, Jr. - Managing Editor, Watertown Daily Times, Donald Alexander - General Manager, WTNH, and Patrick Evans - President, Greater Watertown Chamber of Commerce). The ex-officio members were the Congressman from the 26th Congressional District; the Governor of New York State, Senator from the 46th Senatorial District, Assemblymen from the 112th and 114th Assembly District; and the Commander of Fort Drum, or their designees. In April 1988, the Council was expanded to 23 active members by adding one additional representative from St. Lawrence and Lewis Counties.

Because the Fort Drum Steering Council was enabled under New York Municipal law it had the capability for a number of basic legal functions. The main objective of an inter-government relations council is to strengthen local government activity and to promote efficient and economical government services within participating municipalities. The legal powers include those to make surveys and studies and conduct research programs to improve administrative services; to provide and distribute information from these surveys and programs; to consult and cooperate with other government agencies; to develop practical ways to improve efficiency and planning, specifically within the realm of municipal services; to provide economic development; to promote strong and effective local government services; and to provide a forum for local governments to develop cooperative activities.

The task and challenge facing the Steering Council in late 1984 was substantial. Only a few of the 70 towns and villages within the impact area had zoning or planning capability at that time. A key objective of the council was to manage the tremendous, rapid growth that was expected to occur while retaining local control of the region's future. The Steering Council has, in fact, taken the necessary steps to keep abreast of and address the impacts of the influx of soldiers, civilians, and their families.

As well, the Council served as a sounding board for the Army, keeping the general public informed as to the changes and their implications. More than 600 local citizens took part in the planning process, ensuring that local concerns were fully weighed in the decision and planning process. Local governments overcame the inertia that existed after several decades of economic decline, stagnating tax base, and outmigration of qualified young people. A major goal was to identify and solve problems before they became crises and raged out of control. Throughout the process, the Steering Council synchronized its own planning with the Army's planning to ensure that the local area kept its commitment to accomodate the Army's activation schedule. Other specific objectives were as follows:

- o To expand the tax post throughout the impact area -- to spread the growth as well as share the accompanying impacts.
- o To develop infrastructure throughout the impact area allowing the existing communities to grow.
- o To integrate the military and their families into the community as quickly as they arrived. To preserve the rural atmosphere of the North Country, maintaining the quality of life which was attractive to its residents.
- o To view the Fort Drum expansion as a spring board for future economic development by ensuring that the decisions made during the planning process did not preclude future flexibility.
- o To help local governments to accept and acknowledge the costs that would accompany the economic benefits of the military buildup.

- o To encourage local government entities and existing organizations to expand their capacities so that the Steering Council could dissolve at the completion of the Fort Drum buildup.

The basic charter of the Steering Council was to foster coordination and joint planning among the tri-county communities and to carry out projects in the impact area to accommodate the expansion of Fort Drum in a way that benefitted both the community and the Army. The Steering Council was empowered to do the following: 1) create an inventory of resources to identify assets that should be better utilized and scarce assets that must be increased; 2) forecast the impact of the expansion as was outlined in the Environmental Impact Statement; 3) meld the various public agency staffs to produce cohesive plans; 4) solicit support and financing from federal, state, and local sources; and 5) coordinate the implementation of these plans. Staff and an executive committee were originally envisioned as part of the format to accomplish the overall goals and the specific tasks in a timely manner. Underlying the other objectives was the need for an ongoing source of accurate information to provide to the local community as well as the military and federal and state governments. Thus, the Steering Council was a single contact point to obtain consensus and represent state and local interests to the Army and vice versa.

The day-to-day technical work and coordinating activities were carried out by the Fort Drum Steering Council staff. During most of the 6-year planning period, the Steering Council office was headed by an executive director. In the early years, David Hannum served in this capacity and the later years, Terrence Roche oversaw the office. Assisting him were typically two or three professional staff with skills in planning, economic development, management,

and forecasting/modelling. The executive director was largely responsible for the interface between the variety of actors involved and served to coordinate and facilitate the planning and decision-making process that took place. The technical staff worked closely with local municipal staffs to augment their own activities. They also coordinated technical studies undertaken by consultants, the Department of Defense/Office of Economic Adjustment, and the by Steering Council staff itself.

An essential element of the Fort Drum Steering Council was the establishment of local citizen task forces. Task forces were organized around particular issues and needs that were identified early on as being significant to the success of the buildup. Ultimately, 14 task forces were developed. These included:

- Agriculture
- Economic Growth and Development
- Education
- Employment Opportunities
- Health Care
- History
- Housing
- 801 Housing
- Human Services
- Land Use
- Modeling
- Public Safety
- Solid Waste
- Transportation.

In the Appendix, we have copied the goals and objectives of each of the task forces. This material also documents the major accomplishments of each and will give an idea of how the task forces inter-related and combined their efforts to achieve the objectives of the Fort Drum Steering Council.

Membership on each of these task forces was open to anyone interested in serving, who had expertise to identify needs and formulate solutions to problems within their particular area of specialization. A number of the task forces were very active and had a great deal of responsibility. Others like Agriculture and History, ultimately had a lesser role in the overall process than was foreseen.

The Steering Council staff, in response to requests from the various task forces, gradually grew to include two assistants to the executive director to work closely with the task forces, a computer analyst to expand and localize the fiscal impact analysis, an administrative assistant to manage the office and the budget, and a secretary.

The Fort Drum commanding general assigned representatives from the Army to be involved in each of the task forces where there was overlap of concerns and issues between the military and the civilians. Each of the task forces met and many prepared issue papers to identify those particular aspects that they were targeting. Each of them studied the problems and carried out specific analyses, and ultimately reported back to the Fort Drum Steering Council staff and members. This forum of task forces provided an opportunity for people to bring forth their ideas, to meld various types of expertise, to draw from outside expertise, and ultimately to develop workable solutions for a variety of issues.

A key aspect of the role and involvement of the Fort Drum Steering Council was an ongoing regular breakfast meeting held between Ft. Drum leaders and the executive committee of the Steering Council. Each month these two groups met to discuss issues, activities, and problems and to jointly develop strategies

to resolve them. The breakfast meeting was considered to be a major component in the success of the community and Army in working together. This private forum allowed some of the more sensitive issues to be addressed frankly and permitted solutions to be suggested and tested in an informal setting. The breakfast meetings also helped to and develop a strong trust relationship between the military and civilian community.

B. Fort Drum Steering Council Role

Sometimes the strength of an organization also turns out to be its weakness. The concept of the Fort Drum Steering Council was that they were not a decision-making group, but rather a group recommending policy, strategy and action. Initially the chief role of the council was to provide a format and forum for good information. As could be expected in such a massive military buildup, there were ongoing problems created by the rumor mill, and a panic among some sectors of the community as to what various information meant to them. As the scheduling changed there were corresponding changes in forecasts for soldier and migration data. This kind of information was critical to various sectors of the community in responding to the needs as they occurred, particularly with respect to education and housing.

Generally speaking, the information that was most critical to the community dealt with decisions concerning timing of the buildup, contracting and hiring practices of the post, and decisions concerning off-post housing. There was an established policy among the prime contractor for the military as well as other federal and state officials, that as large a share as possible of employment and subcontract opportunities would be directed to the North Country itself. Information concerning these opportunities was made available to the business community on an on-going basis

so that they could respond, and maintain a competitive position in winning post work. The timing of the buildup had spill-off impacts to all segments of the community. As more people arrived, there was a need for improved social and community service delivery. The task forces overseeing this aspect of the community response kept close tabs on the needs and the likely costs associated with them. Finally, the housing decisions impacted both the local communities and the developers who had been chosen to build 801 housing. The Army's decisions concerning the pace of buildup had a direct effect on development of infrastructure, improvements to the road systems and the entire 801-housing process which required not only the private side of the equation to produce the units, but also the public sector to develop taxing agreements with the developers to allow development to proceed.

Through the media, the Steering Council carried out a major role with respect to keeping the general public informed. They kept the media abreast of changes, the implications and the ongoing activities. As well, the council, working in conjunction with the public affairs officer on Fort Drum, set up a speakers' bureau, and made numerous evening and luncheon speeches to disseminate the data and keep the community fully apprised of the activities. A newsletter -- Steering Council Notes -- was printed discussing key events and changes as they occurred. Finally, the Steering Council was a clearinghouse for others in the community that were keeping their membership and readership apprised of what was going on -- this included, of course, unions, the chamber of commerce, builders' associations, etc.

Consensus building was a key aspect of the Steering Council role. The council played the role of cheerleader and served as a forum for consensus building in generating public support for the activities associated with the buildup at the post. It was a group that suggested specific policies to guide decision making, and

attempted to encourage and equip the community so that the initial and revised time schedules could be maintained for activation of the facility. Developing a role of coordination and a sense of cooperation between the many entities who were involved in all pieces of the process was also a major aspect of this consensus-building role.

The Army prepared on a continuing basis, a numerical forecast of the influx of soldiers. The Fort Drum Steering Council then took these numbers and translated them into the who, what and where of the growth in the area. The staff translated Army statistics into demographic implications for Fort Drum. A sensitive element of this change was the racial mix. Ethnic minorities comprised only about one percent of the North Country's population prior to the buildup, and given the ethnic character of the Army, there was concern as to what effect this new change might have on the community. The steering Council also dealt with that issue. The numbers were input into a model prepared by the staff, which generated the location of families in-migrating, the ages of children, the impacts on schools, etc., for specified points in the future. These data were used and were key to the decision makers at both the government and school levels. (See modelling chapter)

Developing information and data for the participants and leadership in the impact area was one of the key responsibilities of the Steering Council. Under its auspices, or under its direction, a number of studies were conducted throughout the buildup period. One example of this was the Fort Drum Preliminary Fiscal Impact Analysis that was prepared in conjunction with the Office of Economic Adjustment. This study was updated in 1987 to provide specific analysis for each impact area municipality. The information developed by this study set the stage for multi-faceted planning efforts that took place throughout the military growth

period. The impact assessment was a multi-step process which considered both the Army-population-increase impacts, as well as growth in the local labor market and population post. The information developed for the community included an assessment of the change on public service and capital costs as well as a time-phased analysis of these impacts and the financial needs to meet them. Other studies include three housing market analyses; Public Safety Master Plan; local highway study; local government management study; Public Transportation Study (CENTRO), etc.

Another key example of the information maintained by the Steering Council during the six-year period was the tracking of the housing market characteristics and trends. Since housing became the pacing factor of the military buildup, it was important that good information be kept on new construction, vacancy rates, rental levels, median sales prices, etc. Market data were generated for the major geographic impacted areas by collecting information from a variety of sources, including the Jefferson-Lewis Board of Realtors, the Section 8 Housing Office, and property owners.

A periodic housing needs survey by Neighbors of Watertown tracked the housing needs for the low- and moderate-income households as well as the elderly. It identified the rent levels they paid, rent increases, the tenant income sources, income levels, movement activity, and reasons for moving. An example of this Housing Needs Survey is on the adjacent page. It became clear after a period of time that the best data available and the most current information would be maintained by the Steering Council staff.

The Steering Council also took on the role of liaison and coordination between a number of government agencies and the military. Not only were there Army representatives on a number of the task forces, the Steering Council staff kept in constant

HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY
FOR THE PERIOD COVERING 10/3/86 THROUGH 04/07/87
REPORT PREPARED ON 04/07/87 03:48PM

NO. OF SURVEYS RECEIVED = 200

REASONS FOR MOVING

New to area - Military		Rent Increase	21
New to area - Employment	13	\$ - 24	1
New to area - Other	13	\$ 25 - 49	2
Family Size Increase	13	\$ 50 - 74	2
Family Size Decrease	22	\$ 75 - 99	2
High Utility Costs	1	\$100 - 149	10
Mortgage Foreclosure	1	\$150 -	4
Substandard Housing	34	Violence or Family Dispute	32
Needs Subsidized Housing	79	EVICTION	
Fire or Natural Disaster	4	Property Sold	15
Living with Family/Friends	65	Landlord Subdividing	1
Change in Income	12	Nonpayment of Rent	6
		Landlord Wishes to Occupy	4
		Landlord/Tenant Dispute	10
		New Household	22

INCOME SOURCES

INCOME AMOUNTS

CURRENT RENTS

No Income Source	44	No Income	44	No rent	93
Earned	59	\$ 1 - 4,999	76	\$ 1 - 149	17
Veterans Pension	3	\$ 5,000 - 7,999	45	\$150 - 199	21
Public Assistance	81	\$ 8,000 - 10,999	25	\$200 - 249	27
Disability	1	\$11,000 - 13,999	6	\$250 - 299	24
Unemployment Ins.	5	\$14,000 - 16,999	3	\$300 - 349	10
Pension	1	\$17,000 - 19,999		\$350 - 399	7
Workman's Comp.	2	\$20,000 - 24,999	1	\$400 - 449	1
Support/Alimony	4	\$25,000 - 29,999		\$450 - 499	
Social Security	9	\$30,000 -		\$500 - 599	
Soc. Sec. (Disab.)	7			\$600 -	
Supp. Security Inc	10				

NO. OF ELDERLY SURVEYED : 6

NO. OF DISABLED/HANDICAPPED : 36

ELDERLY BELOW \$23,000 6
ELDERLY ABOVE \$23,000

THOSE WISHING TO BUY 2
RENT 196
SHARE 1

NEEDING TO MOVE WITHIN:

LIVING IN : JEFFERSON COUNTY

- 15 days	144	Less than 1 year	23
16 - 30 days	32	More than 1 year	112
31 - 45 days	3	LEWIS COUNTY	
46 - 60 days	5	Less than 1 year	12
61 - days	16	More than 1 year	44

WISHING TO LIVE IN:

Watertown - 125
Black River - 2
Adams - 2
Jeff County
Area - 11
Lowville - 55
Carthage - 1
Bvill/GPark - 2

Living in Watertown for more than 1 year 90
Living in Watertown for less than 1 year 16

ST. LAWRENCE COUNTY

Less than 1 year 1
More than 1 year 3

contact with the Ft. Drum officials as the day-to-day immigration and planning changes occurred. The Executive Committee's breakfast forums with the Division commander were a key element of this liaison. As well, the Army Corps of Engineers was brought in to meet with the task forces and community to discuss such specific aspects as the proposed Army policy for location and operations of 801 housing.

Because the FDSC had been identified as the single point of contact for the community, the several state commissioners who had been challenged by Governor Cuomo to facilitate the buildup process were also in touch with the council. Some of these, the state's Division for Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR) for example, were extensively integrated into the entire process. While a number of elected officials were on the council itself, the Steering Council also maintained liaison with other elected bodies. This included, to some extent, the Drum Area Council of Governments which was established to provide a forum for those towns and villages adjacent to Ft. Drum which experienced the greatest impacts. Federal agency representatives from HUD, FmHA, EDA, and EPA, were also maintained to ensure that federal technical assistance and federal funding were funneled into the local communities.

A final key role of the Steering Council and its staff was its interface with forecasting activities -- housing, education, health care, public safety, transportation -- as well as land use planning. Our detailed evaluation of the planning process reflects the fact that the impact area had a limited capacity for development regulation when the Fort Drum expansion was announced. As a result, the council appealed to New York's Secretary of State, and received funds to establish the Ft. Drum Land Use Team - a small group of circuit riding planners who provided technical assistance to impacted communities, enabling them to build their own capacity. Another key element in the planning activities was

the Steering Council's forceful role in 801 PILOT-agreement negotiations. Community forecast impacts were integrated into the local planning activities.

While it is apparent that the Fort Drum Steering Council was a key element of the response to deal with the massive buildup, our interviews indicated that there were some issues that should be considered if another Steering Council paradigm is implemented elsewhere. We were told that both of the executive directors of the council were retired Army, both past garrison commanders at Fort Drum. When David Hannum was appointed as the first executive director, there was some skepticism in the community that he may have been leaning more heavily towards identifying and meeting the needs of the Army. However, in contrast, others interviewed indicated that while this fact may have been a constraint, without someone with hands-on knowledge of the Army and their organizational structure, the Steering Council would have had difficulty in dealing with the Army leadership. While there is no clear cut answer to this issue, it seems that there are pros and cons to each perspective.

A second issue that we discussed with the regional leaders was the actual membership of the council. Initially, the council contained only a few elected officials from surrounding counties and communities. Ultimately, the Council's membership was enlarged; however, even at its largest point, the Steering Council did not involve officials from villages which were being heavily impacted by the Drum expansion. (This led to the creation of the Drum Area Council of Governments which carried out its own planning activity.)

Here again, we can see the positive and negative aspects of this issue. While it would have been easier to function with a smaller group of officials, the larger community representation

increased the council's legitimacy and credibility. With more elected representatives, the council (while it was not a policy-making body) could take a more forceful position in recommending strategies and action. Some people believe that a major short coming of the membership in the Steering Council was its relative lack of business people. There were very few individuals from the private sector who could take a strong stance on the economic and financial implications of implementing various policies and their impact on the economic post of the community. As well, there were virtually no service providers on the council who could bring to bear the real-life issues of building up services and capabilities in the community. Thus, there is a belief by some that the coordinating body did not have a well-balanced view of the implications of its decisions and recommendations.

It may have been preferable that the Steering Council have some type of decision-making capabilities, but here again, the people on the council were not elected by the impact area at large, and thus were not in a position to make binding decisions. Our conclusion, from our interview results, was that the community was generally favorably inclined towards the structure, activities, and role of the Steering Council.

In summary, the Steering Council turned out to be the key factor in the successful manner in which the community dealt with the massive military buildup. While there were shortcomings concerning the membership of the Council, it in fact incorporated participation from all the key actors who were absolutely necessary to make the process a success. This included the hands-on involvement of Representative Martin's Congressional office on a continuing basis, the participation on the Council by senior executives from both the print and electronic media, and the key elected officials from the City of Watertown, the three counties, and the larger towns.

Because the Steering Council initially took a very aggressive position in drawing in the support and commitment of the state, the state of New York governor pledged his personal support as well as the key members of his administration in providing financing and technical services to accomodate the growth. As well, it has been pointed out that the Army has an on-going role with the Steering Council, providing qualified members on each of the major task forces to ensure that the community and Army planning activities were synchronized and that maximum coordination and cooperation existed during the difficult planning. Lastly, the Steering Council drew in more than 600 men and women from the surrounding communities to participate on its task forces, creating an environment in which the North Country people could identify with the issues and buy into the development for an ultimate decisions concerning solutions to the key issues.

C. Quality of Life Issues

The Watertown area had been a quiet, declining rural area before the announcement was made. The people who had opted to stay and make their homes in the community had generally accepted the lifestyle and the ongoing decline of the economy. The influx of the estimated 30,000 new military and civilian population threatened to bring substantial change to the lifestyle of the region. Some of the key concerns were discussed and solutions found during the task force process.

Housing and the impacts of rapid growth were another concern and a forecasting problem. Some of the worries materialized; as soon as population began to move into the region and the Army leased rental units for its soldiers, existing landlords raised rents substantially. For-sale housing also escalated at a very

rapid pace, making ownership less affordable for local people. In some cases, prices more than doubled. This caused displacement among those households who could not afford the new rent levels, and while the data is somewhat limited, there is substantial evidence that doubling up by living with relatives and friends was one of the results. While there is some evidence of homelessness, the expected magnitude of displacement never materialized.

During the early phases of the buildup, the previously stagnant housing prices rose quickly. Yet, as the construction phase is beginning to wind down, property values have stabilized, and in some cases are declining. The council had a major role throughout the process in expediting housing solutions through active involvement with the Rural Preservation Companies and the Development Authority of the North Country.

One of the early concerns was the impact of the racial change in the area. The tri-county region had only approximately a 1 percent minority racial mix, and it was clear that the Army, with as much as a 30 percent share of minority in the 10th Mountain Division would change the racial balance substantially. The Army, through the Steering Council, counselled that minority interaction should not be highlighted. Army experience in other communities showed that if the community did not make an issue of integration, it would not become a problem. The Army urged instead, that the community become educated on minorities, to promote understanding of cultural differences. To address this issue, a number of presentations were made to local organizations by both the Steering Council and Army spokespeople. Once the Army population began to arrive, several of the churches sponsored events that would give the long-term residents and the new arrivals a chance to meet and become comfortable with one another. A series of cultural awareness seminars were hosted by Ft. Drum for human service providers, educators and businessmen. At the Jefferson Community

College, a cultural seminar was sponsored in which some of the unique differences were highlighted between various groups. Several schools, notably Carthage Central, instituted cultural awareness training for all faculty. The Army prepared itself for information dissemination and, ultimately, concerns about racial impacts did not materialize. It is likely that the steps taken by the community to accommodate the change were largely responsible for this.

One of the impacts that has occurred as many forecast it would, is the impact on travel and commute times. People who lived in the community prior to the impact could get around without slowing for traffic or traffic controls. The volume of cars and vehicles on the streets has, of course, increased tremendously, and while there have been millions invested in street improvements, this appears to be an issue that will become part of the new fabric of the Watertown area.

Increasing crime rates were another fear in the community. There was concern that the influx of construction people would precipitate some undesirable, red-light types of uses; and that the more cosmopolitan, urban Army households would bring with them more urban-type crime. However, the participants in the Public Safety Task Force as well as the local public safety professionals took steps to ensure that crime would not become a major issue. While there has been an increase in the actual number of crimes, the per-capita (crime rate) has actually declined somewhat. Although the local residents perceive the area as being somewhat less "safe" than before, the reality may be that this change has not actually occurred. In preparation for the impacts on the business community, the Chamber of Commerce sponsored a business seminar in which local firms were given insights and training to alert them to potential computer fraud, misuse of credit cards, and bad check practices.

The flip side of the coin to the negative impacts of population growth are the bonuses. People we interviewed indicated that those moving into the Watertown region are more cosmopolitan, forward-thinking, and entrepreneurial than residents who had lived there prior to the buildup. This has brought about a more progressive business and resident community. New school children brought an exposure to different cultures and fresh thinking and new ideas to the school system. Other pluses include the increased employment, the security of jobs, the decline in the number of people on public assistance, the increased property values, the increases in public and private services available, and the return of educated young people to the community. A final spinoff that was identified to us was the improved shopping opportunity. Salmon Run Mall, a major regional shopping center, would not have been built without the tremendous population growth and influx of spending dollars. Many people feel that the bonuses outweigh any of the growth problems.

D. Community Attitudes - Council and Key Leadership

In tracing the history and the organization/management of the Fort Drum buildup, the consultant team interviewed about 175 key leaders. A portion of our interview covered their perception of the previous situation and the change the growth had brought. The North Country was described as a declining, stagnant region -- even to the extent of saying it was ready to slip into the abyss. Businesses had closed and left; industry was declining. Perhaps one of the more significant trends was the outmigration of the young people. Those who were educated and ambitious could not find opportunities in the North Country. It seemed to many people, that the area had little reason to exist economically. The economic post had been slipping and development had come to a virtual

standstill. Our interviewees described the community as inbred, without the creative blood needed for change and progress. This character was the setting for the rapid buildup that was announced in late 1984.

The perceptions of the process and the impact of Fort Drum growth given to us may be somewhat tinged and subjective -- we were talking to the leadership which made it happen; however, the time period with all of its issues and hectic schedule was described as a special time. Governments which either did not speak to one another or certainly had no history of cooperation, pulled together to make the flow of change a smooth one. While in other localities around the country a close working relationship between the Army and the local area may not have been absolutely necessary, in the North Country it was critical. Top people in the Army and the community pulled together, communicated, and made it happen. The region has been revived -- economically and socially. New jobs have been created and the unemployment rate has plummeted.

Local governments which had not been exposed to the issues and concerns of today, were described as being pulled quickly into the 20th Century. Capacity to initiate, manage, and regulate change has been developed. The school system, with the large increase in new students, is now able to offer a far better quality educational product. With the economy back on its feet, with potential business development opportunities, the area offers challenge and opportunity for ambitious, aggressive entrepreneurs.

Of course, with nearly all types of change, there is the downside. The growth in the economy and the massive influx of people have affected the housing market -- rents became unaffordable to some and poor households have been displaced. Some of the business leaders believe that jobs created in this process have been heavily targeted in the lower-paying service area; that

there is still a need to bring in and employ skilled people. Over the long run, there is concern that the economy will become too dependent on the Army, and not evolve into a well-balanced business community. Finally, of course, there are some that bemoan the loss of the rural lifestyle.

The consultant team concluded that for the most part people are positively inclined and excited about the change which has occurred in the impact area and would not hesitate to jump into the process if the opportunity were again to knock (and if we were back in 1984 again).

CHAPTER III

HOUSING

A. Introduction

As we have noted earlier, a major part of the research that the consultants conducted in putting together the history for the Fort Drum buildup was a series of interviews with those people who were active in finding and coordinating solutions for problems that cropped up during the buildup period. Each of these people was asked to identify the critical issues and problems that both the military and the community had to deal with during the last five years. Invariably, housing was noted as the toughest issue to deal with, certainly one of the major problems that the Steering Council and military had to resolve. As a result, we have carefully traced the military and civilian aspects of solutions to housing for both the local people and the soldiers who were brought in to serve at Fort Drum.

The housing issue is two-faceted. From the military perspective, it was the basic factor for pacing the relocation of soldiers to the post. There were, of course, not enough vacant units within the region to house the several thousand people and their families who were going to be working on the post. This necessitated a massive construction plan for new dwelling units, both on the post and in the communities. Initially, there was no master plan to match the development and completion of housing with the arrival of new soldiers. As a result, the Army prepared a computer model -- a Lotus 1-2-3 spreadsheet -- that attempted to match the availability of housing with the needs of each unit. This was an attempt to match construction schedules with the influx of new personnel. Not only did this model look at family housing, it looked at the impacts of transient housing, bachelors' quarters and local rentals on overall military housing needs. As the pacing factor, housing availability dictated the arrival and delivery

schedules of new people and was the one factor that essentially controlled the rate of growth at the post itself.

There were a number of specific issues that had to be dealt with as solutions were found for housing the military, the construction workers and the commensurate buildup of civilian employees who came in to develop the post facilities. First, there were very few vacant, good quality units that were available for rent in the marketplace at the time the buildup was announced. The barracks on the post were quite old and in relatively poor condition. While the Army had the capability for securing funding and beginning to build on-post housing, the capability and the capacity for development in the community was severely limited. During the nine-month period in 1984 before the post expansion was announced, there had been only one building permit for new housing issued in the city of Watertown.

Because the economy had been so sluggish and stagnant for the preceding years, there was no real capacity in the local business community to build housing, nor in the local governments' ability to react efficiently, to the hundreds and thousands of units that would be needed for the Fort Drum growth. As well, there was a good deal of skepticism on the part of the local governments and development community that the Fort Drum expansion would actually materialize. There had been instances in the past where talk of Fort Drum growth had not occurred. As a result, the larger region was initially slow to respond to the need for off-post housing.

Initially, the Army had to make a decision concerning whether the housing would be targeted for largely on-post, or would be dispersed to the communities throughout the region surrounding the post. The decision variables that were considered were the availability of appropriated funds for construction of housing on post, the time required to develop the necessary infrastructure on-

post to accomodate housing, and the desire to assist the growth of the surrounding civilian communities and to quickly integrate the military and civilian populations. Initially, it was estimated that it would require a three-year construction time period to complete an on-post sewage plant, causing delays in the completion of on-post housing. As well, there were forecast problems with the Military Construction Act dollars to support construction on-post; this combined with the expectation of large infrastructure costs, led the Army to conclude that off-post housing was the fastest track to produce the housing units that would be required in order to activate the 10th Mountain Division on-time.

B. The 801 Story

1. Elements of the Decision Making

Early in the buildup, the rate at which housing could be provided for the military and their dependents became the pacing factor for development and expansion of the post. For a variety of reasons, it was important to the Army to complete the buildup as quickly as possible. Funds for the military budget are appropriated each year. It was clear that annual appropriations would be inadequate to quickly provide housing for nearly 10,000 military personnel moving to Fort Drum. Thus, Pentagon leadership looked for the best solution to this issue.

Looking at the experience elsewhere, particularly that of Fort Stewart in Georgia, a specific solution was identified. At Fort Stewart, there had been no program to build military housing. The resulting furor led to enactment of the Build-to-Lease Program, commonly called section 801 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1983. This act permits the development of off-post housing by private development firms. Under the law,

developers finance and build the housing projects and the Army leases them for a period of 20 years.

An initial assessment of potential locations indicated that one single location would not be feasible, either on or off post. This was due to a number of factors; foremost among these were politics. Elected officials at the federal, state, and local levels felt that the entire buildup process would be more acceptable to their constituents if the positive impacts and the burdens associated with growth were shared more widely. In addition, in no place in the three-county impact area was there an infrastructure which would have the capacity of handling up to 2,000 new housing units. While school districts in the impact area had all suffered from the loss in enrollment, no single district had the capacity to absorb the whole increase in enrollment. Many policy-makers felt that a dispersal of the 801 housing units would create a better balance of new students among the districts, and would optimize the use of existing classrooms and support facilities.

Lastly, Army decision makers foresaw that a scattered-site policy would give more flexibility to the development community. By offering some choices, developers would have more control over the land cost, and total project cost. Capacity in the three-county area towns and villages varied. Some were reasonably well-equipped to accommodate growth; others were not. A final factor in the specific location decisions dealt with physical characteristics -- geography, hydrology, wastewater treatment, and water quality. Some areas had been identified by the state DEC as unsuitable for new housing development.

2. The Siting Process

In November, 1984, as the result of a public forum on the issue, the Steering Council sent a memo to communities in the three-county area; it asked community leaders to identify their capacity to accept new housing projects. Analysis focused on the capacity of existing water distribution systems, and how many additional units each system could handle; the capacity of the sewage system, particularly for new development; and the capacity of the school system. Information was sought concerning existing zoning and land use controls. Local perceptions were solicited concerning the minimum and maximum size of development which each community felt it could handle.

The first request for proposals was issued on December 20, 1984. The initial proposals requested 1,400 units to be located as follows:

- o 150 units in Lewis County;
- o 150 units in St. Lawrence County;
- o 600 units in the City of Watertown; and
- o 500 units in Jefferson County (200 units could be in the city of Watertown).

The proposals had to be submitted to the Corps by February 28, 1985. At that time the bidders had to have control of the land through deeds or options, and proper zoning approvals had to be in place.

The Corps received proposals to build these units from several groups assembled especially to bid on Fort Drum projects. One firm that was identified as a preferred bidder, declined to continue in the process after the Corps of Engineers requested a bid extension.

Lucesse, Uccellini, and Kearns, (LUK) won the bid for the 600 units to be built on vacant sites in Watertown and another 400 units which were on proposed sites in Clayton, Philadelphia, Copenhagen, and Gouverneur. Another firm, Watertown, DiMarco, Conifer (WDC) also won the bid for 400 units in Carthage, West Carthage, Lowville, and Gouverneur.

The development of these 1400 units proceeded quietly for about the first half of 1985. During that time period, a rumor circulated in the community that off-post housing would be targeted for lower-ranking soldiers and that the officers would be housed on the post. The Steering Council, keeping abreast of the potential for misinformation, published in their newsletter information which correctly indicated that the 801 housing would include a cross section of the military, from senior officers to new enlistees. During this quiet time period, problems began to develop with the contractors vis-a-vis the cost and profitability of their projects. The key problems were on the cost side of the ledger. The builders had used inappropriate estimates to determine the financial feasibility of the developments, given the agreed-upon rent levels. Construction delays created additional costs. One aspect of cost which had some flexibility was the local property tax which was higher than expected.

3. Environment Aspects

Physical characteristics of potential properties or potential communities were a factor in locating 801 housing. New York State environmental law is comparatively strict regarding the location of new housing vis-a-vis the infrastructure. The New York State Department of Health also has oversight of laws regarding the water supply, as they apply to residential development. Each of the 801 approvals was contingent on the review of water and sewer capacity.

The Department of Health prepared an inventory report on the water capacity in each of the communities.

Similarly, DEC reviewed the sewage capacity in each of the key areas and identified alternative solutions that could be used to augment capacity during the critical buildup period. This study prepared expenditure forecasts for the alternatives. As the communities began to scramble to meet the requirements of the law, they were able to tap into a number of funding sources. These included such state agencies as DEC and the Department of Health. The latter granted monies for fluoridation programs. At the federal level, HUD and Farmers Home Administration funding sources were used to upgrade the infrastructure quality to meet health standards, some of the e grants addressed specific environmental issues.

4. Community Issues

During late summer of 1985, a number of community concerns were arising as a result of the 801 development. In August, Fort Drum officials, the Fort Drum Steering Council, and the Deputy District Engineer for the Corps of Engineers met. Some municipal leaders indicated that they were concerned about site approval for the project plans that the developers were preparing. It became clear that there were going to be some glitches in the entire process.

The two consortiums had received the approvals for the first increment of 801 housing for units which were scattered among a number of municipalities, each of which had different processes and policies concerning the approvals and controls over development in their jurisdiction. It was suggested that a three-pronged dialogue be established: village/city/developer; developer/Army; and

village/city/Army. Because the design work had not progressed very far at this point, it was recommended that local officials begin to work with the developers during the design concepts phase of each project.

By the fall, the communities which were targeted for 801 housing were increasingly concerned about the impacts the housing would have on them. Many municipalities were small and did not have in place the capability for review and control of the development process. In October, the Drum Area Council of Governments (DACOG) held a meeting to try to clarify the issues related to the 801 program, to correct misconceptions, and to provide assistance to those areas which did not have in-house capabilities. At the top of the list of concerns was the issue of costs and benefits. The presentation made by DACOG indicated how communities could determine the cost and benefits of the 801 housing.

In selling the 801 development concept, leaders were told that the developments would pay a market rate property tax. Since this was a new undertaking for the rural communities, explanatory session also indicated the approaches to take in determining property value for tax purposes: use of the traditional appraisal techniques with a detailed explanation of the income approach. Also discussed were approaches to financing development. Private conventional financing was assumed to be the likely choice; however, some of the public incentives programs which could be used to help defray the developers' cost were also considered.

Tax increment financing was one option, as was the use of municipal bonds -- either general obligation bonds or industrial development agency bonds. (The IDA bonding option spurred legal analysis to determine whether this funding could be used for housing development. The conclusions of this analysis were not

very clear as to whether it would be an eligible funding activity, and what type of ownership structure would be necessary to utilize it. In the end, the communities concluded that IDA bonding was not an option to be pursued.)

At this meeting the concept of payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT) was introduced. This PILOT program is one that has been used elsewhere to facilitate private development. A PILOT is a negotiated option between a tax exempt property and a taxing authority. This idea was introduced at this point, because it offers some cost flexibility to the private developer and potential benefits to the community to cover infrastructure costs. The conclusion of the presentation was that the PILOT program appeared to be the best mechanism to collect property tax revenues for the taxing bodies in the impact area. To further explain the rules of the development process, legal assistance was made available through the Fort Drum Steering Council and technical assistance through the Fort Drum Land Use Team.

Given the concerns of the taxing bodies, at the conclusion of a number of these meetings it became clear that a more structured and organized approach to dealing with the financing and taxing issues would be necessary. The next section discusses some of the intricacies of the taxing elements of the 801 process.

5. Tax Aspects

Taxing policy established for the 801 housing units was one of the more sensitive aspects of the buildup. During the initial construction phases of the first three 801 projects, it became apparent that the existing tax levels and the tax policy would not enable the contractors to develop a financially feasible project, and that the full community tax rate would not have been feasible

for the property owners vis-a-vis the post rents that the Army would be willing to pay. Parameters for tax obligations were already established by law. A change in these rates, or a change in the cap on these rates, would have to go back to Congress for approval.

While community leaders had been told initially the 801 housing would be fully taxable, under new assumptions, rates would have to be negotiated to ensure that the development of the needed units could continue. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers prepared a study that evaluated what tax rates and what tax levels would enable the housing development to have a profitable bottom line. The study also assembled data that showed through financial analysis that the housing developments and the lease payments would also be economically beneficial to the Army.

Local communities were skeptical of the Corps' estimates. Initially communities did not agree with the level of subsidy that they should be paying to 801 developers vis-a-vis the tax rate. Many of these communities were several years behind in what would have been considered normal infrastructure maintenance and their level of services was just barely adequate for the population base that they had at the time the post expansion announcement was made. The proposed new housing units pushed some of the municipalities over a cost threshold that necessitated increases in the total level of tax. Any tax subsidy for the 801 housing units only exacerbated this problem.

Some type of compromise solution was needed. In winter of 1985, the 801 issue became heated. The Fort Drum Steering Council made a move to take a more active role in bringing the 801 program back on schedule. Impacted communities realized that, individually, they could not effectively deal with the sophisticated developers or the Army. A number of the

municipalities and tax districts banded together to put forth a united front. The Drum Area Council of Governments created a committee in January of 1986 to jointly negotiate the PILOT issues through an intermunicipal agreement. Parties to the intermunicipal agreement were six villages, seven school districts, seven towns, and the three impacted counties.

The Intermunicipal agreement among these entities created the 801 Housing Task Force in January of 1986; and the Steering Council provided \$10,000 in funding for legal counsel. The purpose of the 801 task force was to ensure that the quality of life within the housing development jurisdictions would be maintained for all residents. To accomplish this purpose, the communities agreed to undertake a joint effort to secure the expertise and to negotiate PILOT agreements that would ensure that the 801 housing developments made a fair, equitable, and defensible payment to each of the municipal corporations involved in the agreement.

Membership in this 801 municipal agreement had three tiers. The first included all of the municipal jurisdictions signing the agreement; the second was an executive committee; and the third was a negotiating committee, also selected by the municipal members. The costs were to be assessed among each of the members based on a pro rata share.

Even though the City of Watertown and the Watertown School District approved of the idea of the task force, they withdrew from involvement in January of 1986. The remainder of the participants continued through the negotiating process, and the remaining municipalities pooled their resources and with assistance from the Steering Council, they hired legal counsel to help them with their tax agreements.

The negotiating process encountered some problems. The Fort Drum Steering Council did not have representation from the 17 jurisdictions that were involved in the Intermunicipal Agreement. The Council was viewed by some municipal leaders as not understanding some of the local issues, and this resulted in tremendous friction between them and the negotiating bodies. In some quarters the Army and the Steering Council were perceived as feeling that the communities were trying to hold up the 801 development process. The communities saw themselves as trying only to ensure the best financial arrangement for their constituents. In fact, the Executive Committee of the Steering Council met numerous times with Ft. Drum and Army Corps of Engineer officials to negotiate on behalf of the 801 Communities. The bottom line was that delays in constructing 801 housing would delay the 10th Mountain Division buildup, and given the political sensitivity in Washington, both in Congress and in the Pentagon, any delay may well have jeopardized the whole Ft. Drum expansion project.

New York State's Municipal Home Rule Law requires municipalities to approve all proposals involving the grant of real property tax relief to a development in order to protect local government revenues. Since 801 project developers made proposals based on a fixed rent per unit to be paid by the Army, any reduction in operations costs improved the profit potential for each project. The communities were negotiating to ensure a sufficient revenue stream to fund anticipated infrastructure costs. As a result, each of the parties involved wanted to ensure that the final conclusions and the final agreement was going to be acceptable to all.

The resolution of the PILOT Agreements was an arduous and time consuming, but very necessary task. It was a major element in the delay of the delivery of the 801 housing units. The basis of the

final agreements for distribution of the PILOT amounts took into consideration the yearly tax rates in each jurisdiction, adjustments according to an agreed upon formula which gave jurisdictions with higher cost a higher return. As the negotiations proceeded, each of these factors was woven into the final formulas.

Technical input that was provided to the 801 Task Force indicated that periodic review would be needed to ensure that the formulas were fairly implemented and that adjustments might be necessary each five years or so. The consultants hired to provide direction to the communities worked through the details of the ultimate formulas. They provided not only legal input, but also direction on the techniques of appraisal processes.

By July of 1986, the task force had developed a package which contained elements on jurisdictional shares of PILOT payments, 801 assessments on sales tax distribution and scheduled PILOT payments and projected taxes. Detailed spreadsheets were prepared for each of the initial 801 housing development sites which divided the payments for each between the village, school district, town, and county. Developers became involved in the process throughout and presented the taxing bodies with their proposals for the PILOT Agreement.

The negotiations for PILOT Agreements with LUK and WDC were going on concurrently, but separately. Initially WDC had proposed to build a cheaper housing unit than LUK, with the same Army rent levels to be paid to each project. Thus, WDC would have more cash flow and would have a capability to pay a higher PILOT Agreement. Each of the developers submitted a number of financial proposals backed by pro formas which were reviewed by the negotiating group. The PILOT Agreements that were ultimately negotiated were different for LUK and for WDC.

PILOT PAYMENTS APPROVED JULY 30, 1986
 Agreed Upon by Leaders of
 West Carthage, Carthage, Champion, Wilna, Carthage School

PAYMT YEAR	PAYMT NUMBER	PILOT AMOUNT	W. CARTH 122 UNITS	CARTHAGE 126 UNITS
Fees & Imprvmnts		500	61,000	63,000
1986	1	633	77,226	79,758
1987	2	520	63,440	65,520
1988	3	280	34,160	35,280
1989	4	1,000	122,000	126,000
1990	5	1,000	122,000	126,000
1991	6	1,000	122,000	126,000
1992	7	1,000	122,000	126,000
1993	8	1,000	122,000	126,000
1994	9	1,040	126,880	131,040
1995	10	1,082	131,955	136,282
1996	11	1,125	137,233	141,733
1997	12	1,170	142,723	147,402
1998	13	1,217	148,432	153,298
1999	14	1,265	154,369	159,430
2000	15	1,316	160,544	165,807
2001	16	1,369	166,965	172,440
2002	17	1,423	173,644	179,337
2003	18	1,480	180,590	186,511
2004	19	1,539	187,813	193,971
2005	20	1,601	195,326	201,730
20 YEAR TOTAL		22,560	2,752,300	2,842,540
20 YEAR AVERAGE		1,128	137,615	142,127
Lump Sum Payment		8,418		
Grand Total		30,978		
Grand Total Avg		1,549		

For example, the LUK formula showed a payment in the first year of the land value assessment at the normal tax rate. During the second year the payment would be \$500 per unit; \$1,000 per unit in the third year; and \$100 per unit in the fourth year. For the subsequent four years annual payments were to be \$925 per housing unit; then increasing to \$940 per unit the next four years; then to \$970, to \$1,000 to \$1,100 in each respective four year time period. At the end of the twenty year PILOT Agreement time, 9 months after the lease termination, the developer would then owe the municipality an additional residual value that would be posted on a number of factors. On the attached page is a computer printout of the agreed upon PILOT payments for the WDC developments.

The developers provided one final wrinkle in the implementation of the PILOT Agreements. Under Article 5 of the Private Housing Finance Law in New York State, any developer which receives a tax subsidy must be designated a limited partnership redevelopment company. Both LUK and WDC established themselves as limited partnerships. They applied for redevelopment company status and provided the legal descriptions and redevelopment plans as designated in the Law. Each of the Village treasurers and boards reviewed their plans and approved them prior to implementing the PILOT Agreements. This arcane law, intended for use in urban areas, enabled the developers to further reduce their local tax burden to the further dismay of local government leaders. One additional fiscal impact in the PILOT Agreements and under New York law, was the sales tax exempt status of the 801 developments.

The Village of Carthage did not accept the negotiated PILOT process. They formulated their own agreement with the developers using the same basic approach, but with slightly different numbers.

Their negotiating process took longer than it did for the others. Ultimately the details were put into place, and the 801 housing projects proceeded.

In discussing the PILOT concept with one of the attorneys from Hiscock & Barclay, the legal counsel which assisted in negotiating the agreements from the municipalities perspective, we gained some additional insights into the problems. The idea of applying payment in lieu of taxes to 801 housing was new; it had not been done prior to Fort Drum. In a normal situation the Corps of Engineers sets forth their requirements, and the bidders identify what they will provide the Army. While the Department of the Army and the Corps of Engineers select a proposal from among the bidders, they do not necessarily have to select the lowest bid. In any event, though, the Army has a fixed amount that they can spend on rents.

In Watertown, the developers prepared their initial financial analysis postd on a tax figure which was typical for rentals in the local community at the time the buildup was announced. Their estimates were substantially lower than the figures that the appraisers developed based on market conditions at the time the PILOTS were being negotiated. Additionally, the developers assumed they would not be subject to the requirements of the Davis Beacon Act; later the Department of Labor ruled that they were to be. Thus, two elements of cost were substantially under estimated, leaving the developers with some severe financial situations once they got closer to the actual development.

By this point, they were under contract to the Corps of Engineers to provide the units -- which clearly were not going to be financially feasible. Ultimately through the PILOTS, the issues were resolved; most people were satisfied with the final results. Enough had been learned earlier that their financial forecasts were

able to compensate for the financial realities that both LUK and WDC experienced.

The on-going payments on 801 developments are somewhat less than they would be if the property were taxed at its fully taxable rate. At the completion of the Army's 20-year lease term that the Army has with the property owner, a lump sum revision will be paid to the municipality. With the payment of this final revision, total tax payments during the 20-year period will have a present value that is equivalent to a normal property tax rate. Thus, the developer and the Army benefit by having lower early payments of taxes, and the community ultimately receives its share for tax payments.

Infrastructure was another issue that was related to the payment of taxes and the development of the needed housing. The agreement was established that the military, through the developer, would pay for all on-site infrastructure improvements. However, the costs for the off-site improvements, which would normally be picked up by the community, would be paid either by the municipal government, or would be negotiated with the developer for the developer to pay their fair share. This is another aspect that has caused litigation and problems in bringing the 801 units into the marketplace and on-line ready for occupancy by Army personnel. For example, the City of Watertown wanted its 801 developer to restore the infrastructure surrounding its sites to a condition that was better than when construction began. The developer objected and when the certificate of occupancy was delayed, litigation resulted.

A number of miscellaneous issues arose in bringing the 801 units into completion. One of those was advertising for bids from developers. Because the established policy was to disperse the housing throughout the area, it was difficult to structure a fairly

or reasonably worded request for a proposal to ensure that proposals would be in locations where the communities wished to encourage them. All advertising was carefully prepared to attempt to preclude any problems.

From the developer's perspective, we were told that the time lost in negotiating the PILOT agreements cost the builders a great deal of money. Developers were paying the financing and carrying costs for their properties during the time period that the PILOTS were negotiated. This caused additional and unforeseen costs which impacted the financial feasibility of the projects. The consultant team was told that, in fact, some of the early projects are not doing well financially because of these delays. As well, there was a perception by some that the PILOT programs did not benefit the communities, that they were of much more benefit to the Army. There are lingering tensions from the results of these agreements. Overall, another region facing a massive military buildup like Fort Drum would be well served to establish a PILOT format at the very beginning and have it in place before proposals are received.

6. Development Approach

Development of the several hundred 801 housing units was a complicated matter. As has been noted, the North Country area did not have a good resource base to build and to finance housing in the area nor was the development process free from complications. We were also told that the local lenders initially were conservative with respect to lending on housing. They had concerns that the reality of the Fort Drum buildup would not match initial projections. As a result, the financing package was extensive and complex pulling in resources from outside the region. Sixty-five million dollars in borrowing involved six insurance companies. As well, there were five series of bonds, which capitalized part of

the development. These bonds have different maturity dates and allow for the incremental development of the housing.

7. Problems

801 Housing was one of the creative problem-solving approaches used in the Fort Drum buildup. However, it was fraught with complications as well. Developers from outside the area had been used to dealing with communities that had already established zoning codes and physical plans that set standards for projects. In the North Country, this was often not the case. Developers had to deal and negotiate with communities that did not have the skills or the background in development of this scale. As has been noted, some of the developers lost a good deal of time in getting their projects up and open. This lost time translated into substantial unbudgeted costs, which ultimately affected the bottom line profitability of the development.

From the perspective of ongoing maintenance and management of the units, there are also some issues that are still to be resolved, or in some cases have already been resolved. For example, soldiers who suffer personal property damage in the 801 housing units can sue the government to recapture their losses. In a number of the projects there have been some losses, and lawsuits are pending. For example, in the Academy Street development named earlier there has been flooding due to poor drainage. In the Clayton project, some water pipes froze and burst, also causing flooding; in Copenhagen there are sinkholes which cause damage to the property and to the housing. Other causes of property losses include gravel on the streets; fire loss in one of the government leased units, damage to vehicles from snow and ice that slid off the second story of one of the government-leased housing units.

Under normal developer and landlord laws in the State of New York, the owner of the property would be responsible for the damage; however, in these cases, the government is responsible for the damage and may be liable to reimburse the soldiers for the amount of the damage claimed. This liability is typically only payable when there is a problem with design or workmanship, negligence, misconduct, etc. The government's recourse in these cases is to seek to recover the losses from the developer or owner of the property.

Some of our interviewees point out that a problem facing the 801 owners is the current lease arrangement. Leases have been inflexible enough that if the soldier is not a good tenant, the landlord has very little recourse. The same applies to a lack of maintenance on the part of a soldier. To offset some of these problems, the Army is now beginning to manage the apartment units directly.

In several of the communities, the certification and completion of the housing units were delayed for a variety of reasons. For example:

- In Copenhagen, the project itself was complete, but the development and finishing on the site was not. A number of mud holes existed which hindered access to homes, and as a result, a gravel drop was needed to stabilize the land. Also in Copenhagen, during the summer when the streams were at a low ebb, the quality of the water was very poor due to the drainage and runoff from agricultural activities in the region. To deal with this, the village had to develop a new water supply and treatment system.

- In Watertown, the developer and the City had a disagreement on who was to be responsible for the rehabilitation of the streets and sidewalks that had been damaged during the construction period. The City wished to have the streets and sidewalks upgraded to a quality that was better than what it had been before. This caused a delay in the completion and the certification of the housing for occupancy, by the City.

- In Philadelphia, the village had an inadequate water supply. To compensate for this, the village had to build a new water tower.

- In LeRay, and Calcium, water problems also existed. In Calcium, the developer paid for the expansion and investment in the water treatment plant there in order to expedite the completion of the dwelling units. However, in the interim, he filed a claim against the government to recover those costs.

Perhaps the most politically sensitive issue among these was the control that local municipal governments had over the certification for occupancy. In some cases, the Corps of Engineers, and the developers perceived this control as "holding the units hostage." The municipality made the ultimate decision as to when the projects could be lived in, and until the developers met municipal criteria and requests, certification would not be provided.

The PILOT agreement and the timing of tax revenues still remain a potential issue. As was noted, the 801 units are not paying a full tax payment in today's dollars; thus the towns and villages are subsidizing them in the short term. The ultimate fiscal impact of this has yet to be seen.

One final comment about the 801 experience is warranted here. Hundreds of 801 units were authorized by the Army in order to accommodate the influx of soldiers. However, there is some belief that the use of 801 in the Watertown area was overdone. Some of our interviewees perceived that the Steering Council and the Army should have pushed for more private development. Under this scenario, the communities would have received their full tax payment, would have had more local control over development, and the free market would have controlled more of the development process. The communities have, perhaps, missed some opportunities that they would have otherwise captured if development had occurred outside the 801 program. It was suggested that towards the end of the process the last 801 units should have been turned off.

In conclusion, the 801 housing development process enabled the Fort Drum area, the community and the Army to provide housing units at a rate which allowed the Army buildup to occur more quickly than would have otherwise been possible. Yes, there were some problems. However, this method seems to have been the most workable in the local marketplace at that time. Were the process to be started again, it is likely some modifications would be suggested. The key would be that the PILOT agreements be in place before the 801 requests for proposals are issued. This would preclude much of the time delays that occurred for developers who had been selected to build housing projects.

The distribution and the site locations of each of the 801 projects that have been completed or are nearing completion is shown below:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Developer</u>	<u>Units Developed</u>
<u>Jefferson County</u>		
Watertown	LUK	600
Carthage	WDC	126
Clayton	LUK	100
West Carthage	WDC	122
Philadelphia	LUK	150
Calcium	NCA	300
LeRay	DOF	300
<u>Lewis County</u>		
Copenhagen	LUK	75
Lowville	WDC	56
<u>St. Lawrence Cnty</u>		
Gouverneur	WDC	96
	LUK	75

C. Community Housing

1. Introduction

During the numerous interviews that were conducted, we asked the respondents to identify the critical or major issues and problems that the community and the Army had to deal with in their massive buildup of Fort Drum. It was typical that housing was named as one of the major problems, if not the key problem, by almost everyone that responded to our questions. The problems were viewed both from the community and the military perspective. From

the community perspective, there was the concern of the impact on local families, particularly lower income families, who would be affected by the rapid escalation of rents and property values. From the military perspective, there was the concern that the housing would be available at a rate that would match the scheduled buildup of military and civilian personnel that would be employed at the post.

2. Local/state Housing Solutions

The Actors

As was noted earlier, at the commencement of the Fort Drum buildup, the State of New York, specifically Governor Cuomo, pledged the help and support of the State of New York in any capacity to facilitate the Fort Drum buildup. Initially, the State made a commitment to help finance and develop 600 dwelling units in the Fort Drum region. These 600 units were to be targeted specifically to the residents of the area, as well as some of the people migrating in, who would require moderate cost housing.

A second key participant in this whole process was the federal government. This involvement came via grants and technical assistance, and included such actors as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Farmers Home Administration and, indirectly, from some of the economic development agencies.

During the buildup, the Development Authority of the North Country (DANC) was established and assumed an active role in the development of housing. As well, a number of non-profit and community-posted organizations were involved in the entire process - Catholic Charities, Watertown's Urban Mission, and Neighbors of Watertown, for example had more an oversight and advisory role.

Some of the quasi-public organization/rural preservation companies built homes under the state's Affordable Housing Ownership Program and already had a track record of low- and moderate-income housing development in the North Country.

Finally, the role of the private sector and the development community should not be minimized. Even though it was difficult to attract them to participate in the beginning -- there was a great deal of skepticism that the Fort Drum expansion proposal would actually occur -- once they were involved in the provision of housing, they played a key role. It took some education to alert them to the issues that were involved; however, once the expansion was underway and some of the incentives/programs were in place, it was evident development would not have occurred without the private community as housing needs could not have been met. The basic elements of the housing strategy are on the following page with detailed description following.

3. State Commitment

The commitment to housing development from the State of New York came from several different sources. A key one, from an overview perspective was the Governor's office which assigned 22 of the existing state agencies to assist in the process. Two of these which were most active were those handling housing and economic development. The lead agency in this effort was the Division of Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR).

With the beginning of the military buildup in 1986, the state sponsored a study of the housing demand and needs of the impact area around Fort Drum. It was prepared by the Office of Housing and Technical Services within the New York State Housing Finance Agency. This study evaluated the growth that would occur in five-

STRATEGY

HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS

- IDENTIFY NEED BY TYPE
- 1986 - TOTAL REQUIREMENT - 9,700 UNITS
- 1987 - GAP = 3,100 UNITS - 2,600 SUBSIDIZED

COMMITTMENT FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

- PRIORITY TO FORT DRUM IMPACT AREA
 - FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION
 - HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
 - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
- INCREASE ALLOCATION OF SECTION 8 CERTIFICATES

COMMITTMENT FROM NEW YORK STATE

- PRIORITY TO FORT DRUM IMPACT AREA
 - DIVISION OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY RENEWAL
 - HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY
 - DEPARTMENT OF STATE
- ESTABLISHMENT OF DHCR REGIONAL OFFICE IN WATERTOWN
- FUNDING FOR NCAHI AND OTHER RPC'S
- ALLOCATION OF LOW INCOME TAX CREDITS TO NORTH COUNTRY
- INCREASE SHELTER ALLOWANCE FOR IMPACT AREA

SURVEY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

- DESIRABILITY OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT BY TYPE AND NUMBER
- AVAILABILITY/PLANNED INFRASTRUCTURE

STRATEGY (con't.)

FORT DRUM LAND USE TEAM

- ASSIST LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
 - ZONING; LAND USE PLANNING (CONTROL GROWTH)
 - PLANNING BOARDS

SOLVE INFRASTRUCTURE SHORTAGE

- DANC - SEWER AND WATER LINES; REVOLVING LOAN FUND
- HUD - CDBG
- FMHA - COMMUNITY FACILITIES GRANTS AND LOANS

INITIATE LEGISLATION

- REVOLVING LOAN FUND - DANC
- \$12 MILLION SET ASIDE - DANC
- OPEN HOUSING TRUST FUND TO NEW CONSTRUCTION
- ESTABLISH INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM

- MEETING OF HOUSING EXPERTS - PROGRAMS AVAILABLE
- MEETINGS WITH BANKERS, REALTORS, DEVELOPERS,
BUILDERS, PLANNING BOARDS, CIVIC GROUPS

STRATEGY (con't.)

OTHER ACTIONS

- ESTABLISH NCAHI - ACCESS FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS
- PROMOTE SHELTER ALLOWANCE INCREASE
- PROMOTE RAISE IN SECTION 8 INCOME LEVELS FOR LOW AND VERY LOW INCOME FAMILIES
- EMERGENCY SHELTER PROGRAM
- COORDINATE WITH DHCR, FORT DRUM, HUD, FMHA

year time periods, focusing on the Army's population projections, the expected natural increase in native population, and the civilian and immigrants. The study looked at recent housing market trends, focusing specifically on housing values, median rents, and median household income. Part of the analysis included an assessment of the amount and cost of Section 8 housing that was being used in the region at the time the buildup began.

Specific problem groups were evaluated: those which were lower-income -- at or below 80 percent of the area median -- and the senior citizen housing needs. As is common throughout the country, households on limited or low, fixed incomes typically cannot afford to buy their housing. In addition, market rents consume a very high share of their income, requiring some type of subsidy (either a rent subsidy to the tenant or a development of financing subsidy to the builder/owner). The study concluded that between 1986 and 1990 the number of households would increase by 23 percent over the 1985 level. Given the expected housing production of the private market, a gap of 4,100 units, 300 sales units and 3,800 rental units would exist. The majority of the rental units (3,500) would require subsidy of some type. The study results are summarized in the table below.

Estimated Net Housing Gap, 1986-1990

Type	Number of Units
<u>Market Rate Units</u>	
Sales Units	300
Rental Units	<u>300</u>
Sub-total	600
<u>Below Market Rate Rental Units</u>	
Military Families	600
Non-Military Families	2,100
Elderly	<u>800</u>
Sub-total	3,500
Total	4,100

Additional study conclusions indicated there would be 9,700 new dwelling units required in total. Of that figure, 4,000 would be military related housing, and the remaining 5,700 would be those that were needed in the community. It was evident that the Fort Drum area would need all the outside help it could obtain, and State programs were an obvious source of assistance. To educate the community on the use of these various programs, the FDSC held a seminar in which each was discussed -- its intent, funding applications, and the grant process. A matrix, which identified the various federal and state programs, the target audience and projects which they could be used for, and the rules for application was handed out and discussed at this session. (See attachment)

It is important to point out that once the military buildup was underway, the impacts on the private housing market were substantial. Housing prices escalated at a rate that was previously unheard of in the North Country. Rents escalated as well, causing displacement. Because new development did not keep pace with demand, decent housing was virtually impossible to find. Development of new rental rents required monthly rents at \$750-\$800 per unit to ensure financial feasibility.

4. Programs Used (State)

In order to accomplish the multitude of housing objectives that were identified in the North Country, the State packaged a variety of programs. Some of these programs are being financed strictly through the State of New York. Others use federal monies, some of which are administered through state offices and by state officials. These programs are state wide - not specifically created for Fort Drum. However, in many cases North Country housing officials had not used them extensively.

Program Administrator	Program I.D.	Brief Description	Eligibility Requirements
USDA, Farmers Home Administration (FmHA)	Community Programs (CP): # Water & Waste (WW) * Community Facilities (CF)	# Direct loans & grants for public water & waste system improvements * Direct loans for essential public safety/health facilities	# 10,000 or less pop. Public body applicant * 20,000 or less pop. Public body or non-profit Loan rates & terms set quarterly; rates & grants tied to median income
FmHA	533 Program	Grant program for housing rehab	All governments, non-profits, consortiums of gov., non-profits, private corp. 20,000 or less pop.
FmHA	515 Program Rural Rental Housing Program (RRH)	Multi-family rental development. Direct loan subsidized as low as 1%/50 years.	Non-profit & for-profit organizations, housing authorities. 20,000 or less pop.
FmHA	502 Program Rural Housing Program (RH)	Single-family home ownership. Direct loan subsidized as low as 1%/33 years.	Low-moderate income families. 20,000 or less pop.
US Department of Housing and Urban Renewal (HUD)	Program 202	Multi-family rental or coop. development. Direct loan with rent subsidy.	Non-profit sponsor. Housing for elderly and handicapped.
HUD	Public Housing	Same as 202	Public housing authority sponsor. Housing for families, elderly, handicapped.
HUD	Small Cities Community Development Block Grant	Grant program for wide-range community development (CD). Two programs: single-purpose/comprehensive.	Unit of gov. must be applicant. Must benefit low-mod income. 50,000 or less pop., & counties
HUD	Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG)	Matching grant to private financing. \$2.50 private to \$1.00 UDAG ratio	Units of Government
HUD	Housing Development Action Grant (HODAG)	Grant program subsidy - rental & coop. housing development	Units of Government
HUD	Section 312 Rental Rehab	Low-interest (4%) loans/ up to 20 years	Low-mod income owner-occupant. Must be in active CD target area.

Housing Development Programs

Program Purpose.	1987 Funding Estimates	1987 Application Deadlines	Possible Linkages With Other Programs
# Rehab existing source, storage tanks, mains, treatment, distribution, collection * Fire/rescue vehicles, firehouses, primary care facilities, municipal buildings	# \$13.5 million, loan \$1.9 million, grant * \$2.4 million, loan Statewide	Throughout Fed. fiscal year - 10/1 - 9/30 Statewide competition	State: RARP-DHCR Fed: CDBG-HUD
Rehab existing single-family housing for low-mod. income. Similar to HUD CDBG housing rehab, but smaller scope	\$450,000 estimate Statewide	March 1987	State: RARP-DHCR HHAP-DSS Fed: CDBG-HUD CP-FmHA
Low-moderate income rental housing for elderly, handicapped & small families. Usually new construction.	\$18 million, 1986 note: \$33 million spent, 1986/177% of allocation	Throughout Fed. fiscal year - 10/1 - 9/30 Statewide	State: RARP-DHCR Fed: CDBG-HUD CP-FmHA
Mortgage financing for new construction, or re-sale of existing housing.	\$30,900 million, 1986 spent note: Spent only 74.8% of allocation	Same as 515	State: AHOP-HFA
New construction or substantial rehab for very-low-low income.	\$8 - 9 million, 1986	Estimate Spring	State: UI & RARP-DHCR Fed: CDBG-HUD CO-FmHA
New construction or substantial rehab	\$0 - 1986 \$0 - 1987	Estimate Spring: \$0 budget	Same as 202
Community development of deteriorated property, rehab residential/commercial structures, water/sewer/street improvements, economic development.	\$30 million, 1987 estimate Usually limited: \$400,000 max- single purpose; \$600,000 - comprehensive	March 1987 Statewide competition	Most State & Fed programs link if relate to housing & community development
Economic development	Funding available based on number of applications nationwide	National Competition 3 times annum-1/30, 5/31, 9/30	State: UDC Bond financing for economic development
New construction, or substantial rehab rental or coop. projects. 20% units for low-income.	\$99.5 million nationwide, 1987 estimate	Estimate: Early Spring. Nationwide competition.	State: HFA Bond financing for housing development
Rehab 1-4 unit single-family; 5+ unit multi-family residential & mixed (commercial/residential)	\$10 million-statewide \$2 million - Ft Drum area	Estimate: 1/87 funds available; 8/87 application due date	New program - regulations & guidelines due 1/87

Program Administrator	Program I.D.	Brief Description	Eligibility Requirements
Housing Finance Agency (HFA) - Affordable Housing Corporation	Affordable Home Ownership Program (AHOP)	Matching grant funds for low-mod home ownership; max. 40% or \$15,000 of total unit cost	Local gov., non-profit & charitable organizations with housing purposes are program applicants, and administer to low-mod individual homebuyers.
Division of Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR)- Housing Trust Fund Corp.	Low-Income Housing Trust Fund (HTF)	Development capital for rehab or conversion of buildings for low-income housing. Grant/\$0/low interest loans, 15 - 20 year terms.	Local governments/municipalities/authorities, non-profit and charitable organizations with housing purposes.
DHCR	Rural Rental Assistance Program (RRAP)	Rent subsidies for low- and very-low income rental housing financed by FmHA 515 program.	Non-profit, limited profit organizations, housing authorities applying for FmHA 515 program 20,000 or less pop.
DHCR	Rural Area Revitalization Program (RARP)	Construction funds for housing & multi-community development projects for rural areas.	Non-profit organizations. 20,000 or less pop.
DHCR	Urban Initiatives (UI)	Same as RARP, above, but for urban areas	Non-profit organizations. 20,000 or more pop.
DHCR	Rental Rehabilitation Block Grant (Rental Rehab)	State administration of Fed. HUD program. Capital grant for rehab with rental assistance voucher.	Title V communities - (Town and City of Watertown) \$5,000 grant per unit to match 50% rehab cost.
DHCR	Housing Development Fund (HDF)	Interest-free loans to non-profit corp. housing developers. Revolving loan fund. Short-term construction loans.	Organizations must be incorporated under Art.11 Priv. Hous. Fin. Law as Development Fund Co.
Department of Social Services (DSS)	Homeless Housing Assistance Program (HHAP)	Grant or loan program for capital funds for emergency, transient & permanent housing. New or rehab.	Local gov., municipalities, non-profit and charitable organizations Rents must equal local public assistance allowance
State of New York Mortgage Agency (SONYMA)	SONYMA Affordable Housing Program	Guaranteed mortgage loan for 1-4 unit owner-occupied family housing. Reduced interest rate, 30 year term. Administered through local participating banks.	First-time home-buyers with 5% downpayment. Low-income applicant priority. Special rates/rules for target areas

*Fort Drum Impact Fund provides additional funds from these programs

NOTE: Not charted
Housing Finance
Bond financing

Housing Development Programs

Program Purpose	1987 Funding Estimates	1987 Application Deadlines	Possible Linkages With Other Programs
690 Provide owner-occupied home ownership to low-mod income families	\$25 million - statewide *Ft. Drum Impact Fund	Estimate Spring/Summer	Fed: FmHA-502 State: SONYMA
Rehab/convert vacant or 40% vacant buildings to rental, coop, condo or homestead housing.	\$25 million - statewide *Ft. Drum Impact Fund	Spring	State: RARP, UI-DHCR HHAP-DSS Fed: CDBG-HUD CP-FmHA
Enable very-low & low-income tenants to pay 30% of income for shelter, while maintaining fiscal integrity of project.	\$5 million - statewide	Feb & Spring	Fed: Direct link to FmHA 515
Fund projects which would otherwise not be feasible, Fill gaps in financing, Provide funds for projects not otherwise funded.	\$2 million - statewide	Spring	Mixes well with most housing/community renewal programs - both state and fed.
Same as RARP, above.	\$2 million - statewide	Spring	Best used to mix with other urban housing, community & econ. dev.
Renabilitate low-income rental housing while maintaining Fed. rent levels for low-income tenants.	\$931,000 - estimate statewide	Spring	State: HTF-DHCR HHAP-DSS Fed: CDBG-HUD
Interim construction financing for planning & development, repaid when permanent financing is closed.	\$10 million revolving fund with \$3 million authority - statewide	Ongoing - 4 -12 mo application process	All private & public long-term capital mortgage sources
Housing for persons without housing, or to be displaced, with little or no income. Single & multi-family rental.	\$25 million - statewide	Spring	State: HTF, RARP., UI Rental Rehab-DHCR Fed: CDBG-HUD 533-FmHA
Encourage home ownership in economically distressed areas. Enable mod-income families to own. New & existing housing.	Not available	As funds are available	State: AHOP-HFA Fed: CDBG-HUD

Agency and Urban Development Corp.
or Housing and Economic Development

New York Rural Rental Assistance Program was created to work in tandem with Section 515 of the Farmer's Home Administration; Section 515 provides mortgage loans with an effective interest rate of 1 percent for 50 years, and is targeted for development of rental housing for low- and moderate-income families and elderly. Section 515 is not feasible when used with very low income households without an accompanying rental subsidy. Consequently, the assistance program provides a five-year rental subsidy to the owner of the project. Up to fifty percent of the units in a family project can receive the Rural Rental Assistance, and up to 100 percent of the units in an elderly project can be subsidized. High unit production using FmHA 515 is difficult. Most projects are 24 units or less: larger developments require stricter scrutiny and thus face time lags in development.

Urban Initiatives -- is targeted to assist eligible not-for-profit community postd organizations in distressed urban areas of the state. The state will provide contracts for the capital costs related to innovative approaches to neighborhood revitalization. Eligible areas must have a population of 20,000 or more.

Rural Area Revitalization Program -- is intended to provide capital to projects which effectively use public and private resources targeted to community and housing preservation in rural areas. Non profit organizations may apply for up to \$100,000 to fund specific revitalization projects.

State Administered Section 8 (Department of Housing and Urban Development) -- provides rental assistance to low- and moderate-income tenants. Contracts are made with property owners, and direct payments for rent subsidies are made to the owner to the extent that the market rent exceeds 30 percent of the tenant's income. Currently, the state has 9,000 units under contract with HUD to provide this direct subsidy.

Infrastructure Development Demonstration Program -- a program targeted to provide infrastructure grants to communities and/or not for profit developers developing new, affordable housing projects. This program is intended to provide some of the gap financing when the developer cannot afford additional costs. It is administered by HFA and is tied to production of affordable units. Legislation targets smaller communities and provides up to \$5,000 per unit for infrastructure costs.

Moderate Rehabilitation Program (Department of Housing and Urban Development, State administered) -- the program provides 15 years guaranteed rent subsidy to owners who rehabilitate their units up to local housing codes and HUD standards. The state has 1,273 units under contract with HUD. Additional units are being added to the program as they are rehabilitated.

Housing Trust Fund Corporation -- a state funded public benefit corporation created to administer the Low Income Housing Trust Fund. Recipients of the subsidy must be not-for-profit corporations or charitable corporations or their subsidiaries, housing development fund companies, low-income individuals, or municipalities. Applicants may apply for funds for rehabilitation or new construction for a specific project, and can receive up to \$55,000 per unit to accomplish this. (Originally, only rehabilitation projects were allowable. However, efforts by North Country leaders led to legislative change which now permits new construction.)

Affordable Housing Opportunities Program (State of New York Mortgage Agency) -- the mortgage agency offers below market mortgages through the sale of tax exempt revenue bonds. Proceeds from the sale of these bonds are used to purchase the mortgages which are originated by participating lenders state wide. Loans

are at a maximum of 30 years with a 5 percent minimum down payment. The program is targeted to economically distressed areas, and loan recipients must be first-time buyers. (Because of the long approval process and high closing costs, local financing institutions used this program minimally.)

Housing Finance Agency Bonds -- The state's agency issues tax-exempt bonds and lends the proceeds to qualified lenders or developers for the construction or rehabilitation of multi-family rental projects. As a quid-pro-quo for the below market interest rate, developers are required to make a minimum of twenty percent of the apartments available to moderate-income households.

Rental Rehabilitation -- The state funnels federal rehab monies through to small communities which have the need and capability to carry out rental rehab programs. The fund provides monies for local government only to be used in rehabilitation of rental units, with a maximum subsidy of 50 percent of the rehab costs up to \$5,000 per unit, combined with Section 8 rental assistance for eligible renters.

As one of the state officials that was involved in this process described it, the state used any program that would work to achieve housing development goals. In addition to these key programs that were named above, other programs were used in a limited number of cases, this included the HUD 202 Program for Elderly Housing, the HUD 312 Program which provides low interest funding for residential rehab, and public housing. As was mentioned earlier, the Farmer's Home Administration 515 Program was dove-tailed with some of the state programs; it was also used singly without other subsidies in the North Country.

Meeting the North Country's housing needs required the development of some fairly innovative techniques. In today's

marketplace, it is difficult -- if not impossible -- to develop housing units for low- and moderate-income families or elderly persons without some type of subsidy. It is, in fact, sometimes difficult to make the housing financially feasible with only one source of financing subsidy. One of the key funding sources that was used in the Fort Drum buildup was the Farmers Home Administration 515 program, which provides one- percent loans to developers which run over a 50-year period.

As previously discussed, the 515 program was utilized with the Rural Rental Assistance Program, a program that was already in place. By combining the two, housing development was feasible: the first program provides subsidized financing for the developer, and the second provides subsidies for the renter. A reported 623 housing units have been developed through a combination of these programs. Of this number, 473 units were subsidized through the landlord. As many as 50 percent of the occupants under the family housing program receive a subsidy, and in developments which qualify as elderly, as many as 100 percent can receive subsidy.

5. Implementers

There were a variety of people who were involved in the implementation of housing development for the community. Among these were some of the existing housing development organizations like rural preservation companies, which focused on low- and moderate-income housing as well as elderly housing. The federal government was involved to a certain extent. The largest involvement came through financing, through some of the HUD programs, specifically Community Development Block Grant and moderate rehab. As well, the HUD officials from the Buffalo regional office came to the North Country and instructed a number of the communities on how to structure and fine-tune their grant

applications, enabling them to receive a number of block grant funds. These funds were used largely for infrastructure costs, which were necessary to prepare sites and public facilities to enable the new housing development. See the following page for a list of HUD grants received from 1985-1987. The State of New York in order to expedite the process, opened a Technical Assistance Office of DHCR in Watertown. This office was staffed with an individual formerly with the Farmers Home who could help facilitate and process these types of applications. The two key local entities active in the successful development of housing were the Development Authority of the North Country and North Country Affordable Housing, Inc. Others took on specific niche roles.

6. North Country Affordable Housing

The Affordable Home Ownership Program (AHOP) has been a major element in the development of affordable housing. This program has an interesting history. In 1985, the Local Development Corporation of Jefferson County (LODEC) submitted an application to the state Housing Finance Agency through The Rural Housing Coalition on behalf of the Rural Preservation Companies in the Ft. Drum impact area. The state awarded LODEC a \$1.2 million grant to help write down the cost of newly constructed housing and home improvements for low- and moderate-income people. In 1986, the LODEC executive director resigned, and LODEC dissolved.

North Country Affordable Housing, Inc., a private not-for-profit housing agency, was incorporated in March 1987 to administer the State's Affordable Home ownership program for the existing local rural preservation companies, and to provide technical assistance to local development groups. It was born from the efforts of the Fort Drum Steering Council, the Development Authority of the North Country, and the Jefferson County Economic

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS
and
URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS
Fiscal Years 1985-88*

Jefferson County (\$6,485,040)

	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Amount</u>
> Carthage	FY'85	CDBG	\$ 400,000
> Dexter	FY'85	CDBG	400,000
> Jefferson County	FY'85	CDBG	400,000
> Philadelphia	FY'86	CDBG	317,540
> Sackets Harbor	FY'87	UDAG	1,012,500
> Sackets Harbor	FY'88	UDAG	1,225,000
> Watertown	FY'85	CDBG	600,000
> Watertown	FY'86	CDBG	400,000
> Watertown	FY'86	UDAG	730,000
> Watertown	FY'87	CDBG	600,000
> West Carthage	FY'85	CDBG	400,000

St. Lawrence County (\$5,262,250)

> Gouverneur	FY'85	UDAG	637,000
> Gouverneur	FY'85	CDBG	400,000
> Gouverneur	FY'86	CDBG	400,000
> Gouverneur	FY'87	CDBG	400,000
> Massena	FY'87	CDBG	400,000
> Morristown	FY'86	CDBG	150,250
> Ogdensburg	FY'85	CDBG	600,000
> Ogdensburg	FY'86	CDBG	600,000
> Ogdensburg	FY'87	CDBG	400,000
> Potsdam	FY'86	CDBG	400,000
> Potsdam	FY'87	CDBG	400,000
> St. Lawrence County	FY'86	CDBG	175,000
> St. Lawrence County	FY'87	CDBG	300,000

Lewis County (\$1,602,363)

> Lewis County	FY'87	CDBG	523,500
> Lowville	FY'85	CDBG	600,000
> Lowville	FY'86	UDAG	157,500
> Lowville	FY'86	CDBG	321,363

GRAND TOTAL: \$13,349,653

Development Corp. FDSC and DANC each contributed \$15,000 toward initial organization and hiring.

It is this group that assumed the original LODEC grant for the Affordable Homeownership Program, and received additional awards under that program for a total grant commitment of \$4,765,800, resulting in the development of over \$15 million worth (235 units) of newly constructed single family homes in the region for low and moderate income families. Five rural preservation companies in the three county area worked with North Country Affordable in achieving this result.

The Affordable Homeownership Program, funded by the NYS Affordable Housing Corp., provides loans/grants of \$15,000 to \$25,000 to income eligible families to subsidize new single family construction. Upon 10 years of owner occupancy, the 0% loan is forgiven, becoming a grant. The program has been utilized not only by not for profit housing agencies, but also by private developers in the region.

In the fall of 1988, a subsidiary corporation, North Country Affordable Development Co., Inc., was formed to undertake actual housing development. This corporation, individually and in partnership with a private developer, will complete 192 apartments and 38 single family homes in two subdivisions (City of Watertown and Village of Philadelphia) by the end of 1991. These projects are financed by a multitude of State sources, including Housing Trust Fund, Housing Development Fund, and Infrastructure Development Demonstration Program, DANC, a local bank, and private investors, utilizing the Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program, for a total value in excess of \$13 million. All are affordable to the community's low and moderate income households, with rents projected at 30% of income.

In addition, there are six other state funded not for profit housing preservation groups in the three county Fort Drum Impact area undertaking housing development projects.

The multi-family housing program was funded at \$5.7 million. Projects under this program are fully subsidized, and currently there are approximately 100 dwelling units that are under construction. Renters who are accepted into this housing program will pay 30 percent of their income. This is essentially a state pass-through of section 8 HUD funds.

The City of Watertown received \$1.5 million through the HUD Rental Rehab Program. This gap financing acts in such a way that the borrower is able to defer interest payments until ten years have elapsed; if the units continue to rent to low- and moderate-income households, at that time the financing becomes an outright grant. The property owner is required to provide a 50-50 match with the government subsidy. This rehab program has been combined with rent subsidies, and to date there have been about 100 dwelling units completed (rehabbed). Through this program a number of previously substandard units have been repaired and made habitable.

The rental rehab program has been used in concert with the Niagara Mohawk energy program. The utility company is offering low interest rate loans and grants to upgrade furnaces, put in storm windows, add insulation -- in general to improve the energy efficiency of housing units in the area. This funding is coming from a refund on an oil overcharge.

Owner-occupied units are also being rehabilitated through monies from the Housing Trust Fund. This also is a deferred loan. Initially it is a zero percent loan that was targeted strictly to owner-occupied units. When the project was first implemented, the state limited its use to rehabilitation of homes; however, in

recent years, the legislature has opened up its use for new construction as well. This change in law was as a result of the Fort Drum needs and requests made by the Steering Council. The law stipulates that the loans cannot be used for profit. However, they ultimately become grants to the homeowner. When a property owner uses the funds for rehab of rental units, the rents then are required to be subsidized for a period of ten to 40 years, depending on the terms of the loan.

7. Development Authority of the North Country

As these examples indicate, a great deal of creativity and program matching was used to meet the housing needs for low- and moderate-income households and elderly in the North Country. Another major player, and another approach taken to meeting housing demands came through the involvement of the Development Authority of the North Country.

Once the community became involved in the production of affordable housing, community leaders realized that the existing housing and economic development agencies did not have the resources or the capability of producing housing on a large scale. It was recognized that a new organization was going to be needed to implement projects and policies that the Fort Drum Steering Council had originated. The Steering Council requested that the state draft specific legislation to allow the tri-county area to establish its own development authority. This legislation was prepared through a process of negotiation and refinement before being approved by state lawmakers.

DANC is a public benefit corporation within the State of New York, which had a short-term mission to develop infrastructure to facilitate the development of needed housing. Completion of the

sewer line from the post to the Watertown treatment plant will enable a number of units to come on line along the sewer corridor. Approximately 1,100 units are anticipated sometime in the future. DANC was capitalized largely by a \$12 million funding through a state Infrastructure Trust Fund appropriation. Again, the objective of DANC's housing programs is to provide infrastructure subsidy and gap financing to ensure affordability.

DANC has two programs that it has implemented to achieve these objectives. The first is a Housing Loan Revolving Fund (HLRF), which was capitalized through legislative appropriation. This program has been used in conjunction with two other funding sources. The first is the Farmers Home Administration 515 program, which provides deep interest subsidies. The second is the affordable home ownership development program that operates through the state Affordable Housing Corporation, and administered for many groups through North Country Affordable Housing, Inc.

The Housing Loan Revolving Fund was initially capitalized through the state for \$750,000 in the 1987 fiscal year. Subsequently, it was recapitalized for \$1.25 million in the '88 fiscal year, and \$1.25 million in the '89 fiscal year. The objective of this fund was initially to provide infrastructure financing for housing projects which would house low- and moderate-income families. Applicants can be government units, not-for-profits, and for-profit entities. Eligible costs under this program include predevelopment expenses, such as planning, architectural/engineering fees, and land assembly. Development expenses, with a focus on streets, water, sewer, and drainage are also eligible. Government entities may apply for funding from this source to develop infrastructure needed to support housing. This is intended to be targeted to improvements which will permit the development of affordable housing, and not utility type of facilities.

Generally, this program has been offered as a mini-Urban Development Action Grant program. Most of the financing packages are loans, with a seven-year payback period and interest rates that average about five percent. The terms of each of these HLRF projects are developed individually by looking at the specific projects. The bulk of this fund is being rolled over, and will provide funding for additional loans of this type. With these programs, DANC has sponsored 14 projects with 359 dwelling units. They were built largely in four subdivisions, with additional assistance from Rural Preservation Companies through the affordable home ownership housing program.

The second loan program that has been sponsored by DANC is the Affordable Rental Program which had \$12 million in funding available. This program was one that is new and was designed specifically for local needs by the DANC staff, DHCR, Ft. Drum Land Use Team, FDSC, and DOB.

In 1987, the State of New York had \$650 million in an existing fund from a federal windfall, of which \$325 million was targeted for housing. The Fort Drum Steering Council and DANC leadership proposed to State Senators John McHugh and John Daly, and the Senate Finance Committee that \$12 million from this fund be allocated to DANC for development of affordable housing. At the end of the 1988 legislative session, the development authority was authorized to create a program which would implement the \$12 million in funding. The program guidelines were developed by DANC with legal, programmatic, and architectural assistance, as well as input from the state's Division of Housing and the Division of the Budget. After review by the Division of the Budget, the program was approved, and a request for proposals was issued in November, 1988.

The legislation which enables this program allows broad discretion in the design and financing of individual projects, with the one stipulation that all projects be limited to low-income households. The program, as its name implies, is targeted to a full range of low-income rental units with a target of 480. Monies can also be used to support the development of additional for sale housing if combined with other financing mechanisms. Directed developers who applied for funding to site their projects where water and sewer is available and community services are easily accessible. Very specific design, site, and building standards have been established.

At about the time the Affordable Rental Housing Program was established, the Development Authority of the North Country was designated as a Housing Credit Agency by Governor Cuomo and received an allocation of \$1.085 million in federal Low Income Housing Tax Credits. Developers who wish to use the Tax Credit allocation must include this as part of their ARHP submission to DANC. Each of the proposals has been evaluated postd on the development team qualifications, the proposed design, the financial and socia lmpacts, and feasibility and readiness of the proposal. The result is the combinations of financing incentives produce rental units with an economic value of about \$800 per month with actual tenant rents ranging from \$225 to \$450 per month.

Under this program, several deals have been packaged using tax credits and syndication. In January of 1989, the first loan was made under this program. Currently, there are seven projects that are in the works. Five of these are new construction rentals, which will offer rents at a typical \$250-\$450 a month rate per unit. The remaining two projects will be under construction during 1990. These are both downtown projects; one of these is the reuse of an existing hotel. The seven projects will result in 573 dwelling units; of this total, 268 will have tax credits. This

funding program also has been combined with other funding sources; for example, of these seven key projects, four of them also have Infrastructure Demonstration Development Program funding, and four of them have monies from the Housing Trust Fund. (See attached chart)

In order to attract the financiers and the syndicators to projects of this type, the DANC staff had worked with a number of financial models to ensure that the financing would be feasible. Their objective was to achieve an internal rate of return of three percent. By evaluating the cash flow and the net residual of each of the properties, the staff was able to tailor each of the loan packages to the individual needs of the project. This program has speeded the construction of housing units by enabling local leaders to control the funding source. They have actually achieved a 3:1 leverage ratio.

All funds were awarded by January, 1989, and DANC was able to expedite its own schedule for developing affordable housing. With a focus on infrastructure subsidy, they have worked with other agencies. For example, they utilized the New York State Housing Financing Agency program -- Infrastructure Development Demonstration Program -- which provides \$5,000 per housing unit in subsidy. A recent accomplishment under these jointly funded developments is the Kelsey Creek subdivision in the City of Watertown, containing a mix of single family homes and apartment units.

In sum, it is evident that the military buildup in the North Country initially created a tremendous need for housing. The community response has been to address the needs of its people -- both the local residents and Army households. The innovation and ambitious programming is a reflection of this concern.

AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAM (ARHP)

DETAIL ON FUNDED PROJECTS

PROJECT	# UNITS			BEDROOMS			RENT LEVELS		TAX CREDIT ALLOCATION	DANC \$	DANC \$/ UNIT	N.L. S.F.	DANC \$/ N.L. S.F.	DANC RATING	TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST	TOTAL PER UNIT COST	TOTAL HARD* \$/ N.L. S.F.	TOTAL DANC REPAYMENT	FUNDING DATE
	1	2	3	1	2	3	TAX CR.	MOD. INC.											
1 BACON-WAIN	100	20	60	20	60	20	50	50	\$108,408	\$2,870,000	\$28,700	83,032	\$34.58	71	\$5,070,000	\$50,700	\$50.17	\$1,524,153	3/84
2 GATES	104	-	104	-	104	-	80	24	\$374,235	\$2,700,000	\$25,962	88,400	\$30.54	65	\$5,400,810	\$51,929	\$50.13	\$4,124,213	3/84
3 CONIFER	100	40	52	8	52	8	85	15	\$451,191	\$2,668,774	\$26,688	90,680	\$29.43	65	\$4,852,316	\$48,523	\$44.11	\$4,129,697	3/84
4 BACON-PHIL	32	6	20	6	20	6	13	19	\$81,188	\$912,400	\$28,513	27,582	\$33.08	70	\$1,728,000	\$54,000	\$52.90	\$1,486,119	3/84
5 HENRY KEEP	41	41	-	-	-	-	-	41	-	\$1,082,000	\$26,390	37,350	\$28.97	71	\$2,164,000	\$52,780	\$51.50	\$1,539,290	3/84
6 FARASH	156	24	108	24	108	24	-	156	-	\$935,000	\$5,994	134,640	\$8.94	62	\$9,122,908	\$58,480	\$53.09	\$3,439,627	3/84
7 BRIGHTON	38	36	-	-	36	-	38	-	\$212,112 *	\$1,500,000	\$41,667	22,392	\$66.99	80	\$3,000,000	\$83,333	\$105.76	\$2,467,65	3/84
8 NORTHWOOD	21	19	2	-	21	-	21	-	\$150,000 *	\$207,841	N/A	E	N/A	N/A	\$2,000,000 E	\$95,238 E	\$106.87 E	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	530	186	346	58	285	305	285	305	\$1,447,112	\$12,878,015		484,078			\$33,337,834				

* Conditional allocation only. Dependent on receipt of credit authority from N.Y.S.

E = Estimated.

8. Other Factors

Modifications in other existing programs were needed in the North Country to ensure that housing subsidies were workable in light of the new marketplace. For example, shelter allowances were increased twice by the federal government as the market rate rentals were increased. This came about because the federal government recognized that their market housing rate had gone up substantially during the buildup period and that average rents were considerably higher than they had been in 1984. Likewise, state welfare multipliers were increased to accomplish the same objective. Families were given larger dollar amounts of subsidy for their housing use in order to pay the higher rent they faced. Finally, the Section 8 program saw an increase in the allowance for certification. That is, a larger number of Section 8 units were authorized within the region.

In conclusion, the community appears to have met its housing objectives well. As was noted earlier, 9,700 new units were needed to meet the forecast housing demand in the region. Already 4,000 of the units identified as needed to be built by the Army are complete. In recent years, the Fort Drum Steering Council staff has begun tracking building permits in the area. According to their data, of the 5,700 units that were needed in the community at large, at this point 4,500 have already been built. Currently under construction, are 650 dwelling units in the Kelsey Creek project, North Country Associates, DOF, and Farash developments. Thus, approximately 600 units of the original objective have not yet been supplied. An updated housing market analysis has been commissioned to determine how many more new housing units will actually be needed and what share of these should have a subsidy.

SUMMARY OF NEW YORK STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
IN FORT DRUM IMPACT AREA
COMPILED AUGUST 2, 1989

	STATE	FEDERAL

HOUSING:		
DHCR	\$25,349,925	
DANC	\$14,000,000	
515		\$17,000,000
202		\$2,700,000
PUBLIC HOUSING		\$2,700,000
SECTION 8		\$2,700,000
HUD		\$13,000,000
DOD		\$130,000
HOMELESS HOUSING		
ASSISTANCE GRANT	\$500,000	
=====		
TRANSPORTATION:	\$38,200,000	
=====		
LAND USE:		
FORT DRUM LAND		
USE TEAM	\$625,000	
=====		
PARKS, RECREATION,		
HISTORICAL PRESERVATION		
	\$371,000	
=====		
TOTALS	\$89,547,925	\$39,202,101

CHAPTER IV
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

A. Infrastructure

1. Major Issues

The North Country was not equipped or ready to deal with the expansion of Fort Drum. The post itself did not have the infrastructure that would be required to accommodate the large-scale growth and development that was planned for the facility. The communities -- the City of Watertown, the towns and villages -- were also not prepared to deal with the housing development and commercial projects that would result from immigration of people and businesses into the region. Improvement to and major expansion of the existing infrastructure facilities would be required to enable the growth to proceed. This included water lines, water-treatment facilities, sewer mains, and sewage treatment plant capacity expansion.

The Fort did not have the sewage treatment capability to deal with the volume that was expected to be generated by the post itself. Local facilities were generally in bad shape. This was particularly true in the City of Watertown. Generally speaking, the capacity existed, but the infrastructure was aging and deteriorating. Both water treatment and sewage treatment plants needed refurbishment anyway; Fort Drum was the catalyst and provided the financial means/outside funding to pay the cost.

Because of the declining economy, very little had been invested in the City's infrastructure during the decade before the buildup and a great deal was required to bring these facilities up to commonly accepted standards. To compound the cost issues, in

the smaller communities, soils in certain parts of the region were difficult, and limited the amount of septic tank development that could be accommodated on them. While not directly tied to the Fort Drum expansion, the region was badly in need of a new landfill. This demand would have ultimately come about without the Army development and expansion, however, the accelerated population growth associated with the Fort made this need more pressing.

Over the years the road network in the region had been badly neglected. The problem existed on major highways as well as in the neighborhood areas. During construction times, some of the existing street infrastructure -- the sidewalks, curbs and streets -- became even further damaged by construction equipment.

The issue of infrastructure has been mentioned throughout our discussions of housing and affordable housing development; it was one of the key factors that was linked to the development and the provision of housing for both the community and for the Army personnel living off post. Because infrastructure adds an exceedingly high cost to the development of new neighborhoods and communities, the capability of bringing on infrastructure at a low cost to those in the development arena was critical. Physical development was linked to or dependant on the completion of infrastructure. Any delays of this type would only delay the entire process further.

2. Solutions: Development Authority of the North Country (DANC)

It became clear early on that the provision of infrastructure was also going to be a pacing factor in the development of off-post housing as well as the development of the post community itself. The leadership in the Fort Drum Steering Council concluded that

another entity would be required to oversee and implement the development of the needed infrastructure facilities. For this reason, the Fort Drum Steering Council, working through the liaison with the state government, requested the state legislature to draft legislation for and approve authorization to establish the Development Authority of the North County. The enabling legislation charged DANC with the responsibility of building community infrastructure needs that are tied to the expansion of the fort. Initially, the focus was on the development of sewer facilities. However, the Development Authority spanned all types of infrastructure development. The establishment of a tri-county regional type of authority was unique; it established the precedent for a regional partnership to oversee and implement needed facilities, and gave a single agency the capability to bond for the needed investment.

DANC was created by an act of the State Legislature and organized on October 31, 1985. It is a public benefit corporation under state law, and one of several that have been established in the state, with powers and authority to implement economic development activities. It has a 13-member board -- eight of these are voting members. The voting group is appointed by local elected officials; two members are appointed by each of the three county boards of supervisors (Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence); the Watertown City Council also appoints its own two representatives. Five others are appointed by the governor, one at the recommendation of the Senate and one at the recommendation of the Assembly. These are non-voting members. The by-laws of the Authority require that a quorum of voting and non-voting members be present before any decision can be approved. While DANC has the capacity to bond, some of its powers overlap with those of local industrial development authorities. DANC has been careful not to duplicate existing local agency capabilities. Likewise, it must receive municipal approval before it uses eminent domain.

The Army early determined that the lack of sewage and water facilities on post would constrain the desired timetable for the activation of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum. Additional water sources had to be found and more mains would be required. Under normal military circumstances, the Army would build these facilities on post.. However, the Fort Drum situation was unique; the local community also required an upgrading of their infrastructure and facilities. A cooperative effort and study between the Fort Drum Steering Council, the Development Authority and the Army determined that the optimal solution was for the facilities to be developed and expanded off-post and for Fort Drum to be linked to them with new mains. The Army agreed to utilize the upgraded treatment plant that was located in the civilian community. An agreement to develop water systems has recently been reached.

The first order of business was the completion of a sewer line that would connect the post to the existing Watertown sewage treatment plant. In order to find the optimal route for this line, task forces and the Development Authority evaluated five alternatives for proposed routes. Each of these routes was weighted in terms of the financial cost and the financial feasibility of its completion. Postd on the study, the Willow Creek route was selected. In addition, there was a good deal of local input and comment on the siting of the main. Economic development leaders felt that an appropriately located facility would open up a previously unserved area for new growth. The Willow Creek route is viewed as offering the best potential for new growth.

As a public benefit corporation, the Development Authority is endowed with special financial capabilities and powers. Initially to begin this process, DANC borrowed \$2,000,000 from the state.

Because this was the first move into major financing activity, the staff of DANC received technical assistance and bond counsel from Lazard Freres. Yet \$7 million was borrowed from local banks to build the sewer line. Once it was in operation, DANC sold bonds to investors for about \$15.5 million to repay the banks.

Essentially the Army, the Development Authority, and the City are partners in this project -- the Army had studied the volume of sewage treatment that it will require on a monthly basis. The entities negotiated and discussed an appropriate payment schedule and agreed upon a mutually acceptable payback for sewage treatment services. The essence of this agreement is that each month the Army pays a flat fee toward a portion of the bond's principal and interest payments. An additional monthly operating cost assessment is paid by the Army directly to DANC, who pay the City of Watertown for treatment services.

Because of the increased volume of sewage effluent, there was a need to expand the existing sewage treatment plant. The plant was in the City of Watertown, and was not large enough to deal with community growth of approximately 25,000 people. After a study was done, the plant was expanded to a size that would provide the necessary capacity. The expansion of the plant was financed through City of Watertown general obligation bonds. The Development Authority pays the City a monthly fee from its Army revenues, which the city uses to repay its bonds.

It is interesting to note that the Army had paid for the design of a \$31 million sewer plant on post. In cooperation with the local community, it abandoned its plans in favor of DANC's taking the lead -- all part of the good-faith effort to promote economic development in the region.

Another key element in the infrastructure process was the need to upgrade the local water treatment facility. To begin this task, the Jefferson County Industrial Development Authority funded a \$120,000 water study of the needs of the County. The conclusion of this study prepared by O'Brien & Gere was that a new water plant was required. By using redevelopment bonds, the City of Watertown financed and expanded its water treatment plant.

The arrangement with the Army for water supply is similar to DANC's agreement with the Army on sewage treatment. Each month the Army pays a fixed portion of the principal and interest costs of the bond. As well, the Army pays a pro-rata-share of the cost of operating the plant. As of early 1990, the Army and DANC were working to develop a joint understanding and contract for the cost sharing of this extension. At this point, the completion of the water line expansion is expected by 1991.

Some of the surrounding communities also sought out their own solutions for infrastructure. For example, the town of LeRay created its own sewer district. It tapped into the sewer line that was discussed above. Le Ray will be charged a pro rata share for its ability to tap into the main line and pays a monthly fee for treatment services. With this additional income to DANC, the Army will be credited for the share that LeRay uses.

Villages have also experienced the need to upgrade portions of their infrastructure facilities. These have been financed with Small Cities Community Development Block Grants and through Farmers Home Administration monies and local tax revenues. Some of the larger capital projects associated with Fort Drum-related population growth are shown below:

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Capital Project</u>	<u>Est. Cost</u>
Village of Carthage	Water & Sewer Project	\$ 300,000
Town of Champion	Proposed Sewer Treatment Facility & Lines	\$ 1,630,000
Village of Clayton	Sewer expansion project	\$ 2,100,000
Village of Copenhagen	Water system expansion (paid through local donations and labor)	\$ 30,000
Village of Dexter	Storm and Sanitary line separation - paid by HUD grant	\$ 400,000
Village of Gouverneur	Storm and Sanitary line separation (\$400,000 from HUD grant)	\$ 1,200,000
Village of Lowville	Extension of sewer lines to 801 site	\$ 8,000 - 10,000
Village of Philadelphia	Sewer Expansion Water and Sewer Expansion to 801 site (HUD grant) Electric expansion Lift station to school	\$ 1,200,000 \$ 400,000 \$ 755,000 \$ 170,000
City of Watertown	Expansion of Waste water treatment Renovations to Water treatment plant (1/3 Cost to Authority)	\$13,500,000 \$12,000,000
Jefferson County	Additional office space (Sears Building) New Public Safety Building (Joint City-County)	\$ 1,200,000 \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000

The solid waste issue deserves some discussion. A landfill was needed before the Drum announcement was made. But the build-up speeded the argument and offered a political will to address the issue. The Army had to close its on-post facility and at one point there was talk of putting a regional landfill at Fort Drum. The concept was rejected by the Army, which has offered to

participate in finding a solution. Currently site 60 in the town of Rodman is in the process of being permitted. The development of the regional landfill has been a potent local political issue regarding siting, wildlife, geology, traffic and community impacts, etc. NYS DEC Administration Law Hearings will decide if permit is to be issued.

In concluding this section, we would like to point out that the underlying premise to finding infrastructure solutions was one of cooperation between the Army and the surrounding community. By building in Army participation, the close-in impact area was able to open an 11 mile development corridor fully served with sewer and water. The water issue had been a development obstacle for a long time. Watertown had no resources to pay to upgrade its facilities, and the cost of distribution was prohibitive. The Fort Drum expansion created a new climate and forced cooperation among the local communities. Synergism resulted. As well, the influx of solution finding people who came with the growing population, helped bring about change.

B. Economic Development

1. Issues

At the time the Fort Drum buildup was announced, the economy in the Watertown region was in poor shape. Unemployment was approximately 17 percent; and in the early 1980s, it even approached 20 percent. It was clear to the local community leaders, particularly those involved in the Fort Drum Steering Council, that economic development should be a top priority to be dovetailed and coordinated with the expansion of the post.

One of the key task forces organized to coordinate this effort was the Economic Development Task Force. The task force members,

working with staffs of local and regional economic development officials, identified a number of issues and opportunities that needed to be addressed by the community during and after the expansion. Perhaps foremost of the issues identified was the need to capitalize on economic potentials and opportunities that would be created by the expansion. This included not only the business development that would result from the construction on and off post, but also long-term opportunities that would be created by a major economic entity on the Fort.

Steps were taken to determine what types of buildup needs would exist, and to ensure that local residents would get a shot at any new job opportunities. Local leaders met with the main on-post contractors to identify construction and operation skills that would be needed during the development process. Simultaneously, a study was made to identify the local skills that would be available. Local unions were part of the task force. Their leadership took steps to ensure that local people qualified for union membership to be part of the construction program.

A study was conducted by the Private Industry Council of local employers to determine if there could be potential shortages for various types of skills and jobs. Another survey under the auspices of the Job Opportunities Task Force identified labor needs of post contractors and compared needs with local skills. The studies each concluded that there would, in fact, be some shortages, and there was an effort to identify where outside help would be required. The Job Training Partnership established the need for a recruitment program, one that would fill new jobs as they arose, and would find replacement staff for people who had left existing jobs to step up into more attractive military-related jobs.

Equal employment opportunity targets were recognized as being important as was the need to provide minority companies and minority employees with opportunities to take part in the process. However, the North Country had a small minority population at the outset of the military buildup (comprised largely of American Indians). Equal employment requirements were carefully monitored by both the public sector and private contractors. (Because the target area for hiring extended as far south as Syracuse, the post prime contractor pulled from a geographic area beyond the North Country.) Interview input we received indicates that the actual experience surpassed the set objectives.

An interesting footnote reflects the success of the efforts to put local people to work during the buildup. The FDSC, with the cooperation of the Ft. Drum Provost Marshal surveyed the work force through motor vehicle registrations. Of the total, 65 percent of the workers were from the three-county impact area and 85 percent were from the surrounding nine-county area. Brick masons and electricians had to be brought in from outside the region.

2. Approaches

Development Authority of the North Country

As with housing and infrastructure development, the Development Authority of the North Country had a key role in the economic development process. Initially the Urban Development Corporation spent \$500,000 on a consultant study to identify the parameters and guidelines for ongoing economic development activities. This study evaluated and prepared an economic post analysis to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the Watertown region, particularly after the completion of the 10th Mountain

Division buildup. The consultant designed a model to assess the impacts that the Army facility would have locally. From this, there were several scenarios developed which showed the Development Authority options for future growth and job and business development. The final product of the consultant study was an overall strategy for economic growth and 38 specific project recommendations. (Many have been implemented.)

Recommendations that came from the study were actually programs which could be more easily implemented at the regional level, as opposed to a smaller three-county area. To mobilize and implement the recommendations, six counties including Clinton, Essex, Franklin, Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence organized themselves into the North Country Alliance. The Alliance is a non-profit local development corporation, established to promote economic development in the North Country. It is comprised of each of the six-county industrial development agencies, and fifteen regional or sub-county economic development agencies. Each of these members is an economic development agency itself, and the Alliance represents the overall interest. Initially, the director of economic development for the Development Authority of the North Country, Robert Juravich, also served as the President of the Alliance. The organization will be responsible for carrying out regional economic development programs and helping to fund these through state and local sources. The Alliance has prepared a strategic marketing plan which was unveiled in March of 1989. The three key areas in which the Alliance will promote economic development are:

- o Business Development;
- o Joint Regional Marketing and Industrial Recruitment; and
- o Special Regional Products.

The Alliance has identified several key areas in which it will focus its activities. These include: 1) target market identification, focusing on industries that are experiencing growth and which have locational needs that can be met in the North Country; 2) gain exposure among the target industries; 3) encourage information acquisitions by firms in these industries - that is to make information available through literature and statistics. The industrial types which are being targeted include wood products, miscellaneous plastics, apparel industry, fabricated metals, and back office. Targeted secondarily are warehousing, high technology, bio-technology, and agribusiness.

To effectively attract new economic growth to the North Country, the Alliance is undertaking the following categories of action to carry out its program:

- o Image/Marketing of the Region: At the time that the build-up began and even after DANC was formed, there was no plan in place to market the capabilities and opportunities in the North Country. Because of the prior loss of business and the decline in population, the area had a negative image, both to outside investors as well as to local entrepreneurs. The image and marketing element established programs to address both real and perceived issues. An advertising campaign has been conceptualized -- regionally targeted as well as industry specific -- with placement in publications, telemarketing, direct mail campaigns, and out-of-town missions.
- o Regional Revolving Trust Fund: NCA received monies from the New York State Urban Development Corporation to establish a fund which is to be applied toward the

capitalization of small businesses. These funds will be distributed as a result of applications from start-up and growing businesses in the region, and will be to the greatest extent possible used to leverage targeted businesses.

- o Export Assistance Program: The Alliance will provide qualified executives to provide technical assistance for and work with existing companies to assist them in expanding. The main focus of this effort is to ensure that companies can find markets for their products outside the Watertown region.
- o Targeting: NCA has identified wood products, miscellaneous plastics, apparel, fabricated metals and back office business sectors which offer opportunity for development of new businesses within the region. These will be prime targets for recruiting new business or starting up new businesses in the marketplace. In early 1990, the NCA staff was in the process of developing sales materials to assist in this marketing process. Also planned are trade shows, in which targeted businesses can be brought in to try to sell them on a regional location in the North Country.

Other action areas that are being implemented under the guidelines of the North Country Regional Economic Development Masterplan (but not under the auspices of the North Country Alliance) are as follows:

- o Anchor Development Projects: Also identified in the consultant study were several real estate development projects, which could be encouraged to leverage the recommended comprehensive economic development strategy.

Among these development projects are four season resorts, a convention center (A recent consultant study by ZHA was completed to determine the feasibility of such an activity. According to ZHA staff the report concluded that a convention center was not feasible; a multi-purpose center was recommend in its stead), and waterfront-related developments. Finally, a portion of the development package recommendations includes suggestions on ways which local utility companies can actively promote development projects.

- o General Business Assistance: Existing businesses are being assisted in obtaining permits for exporting their products abroad.

Job and Business Development Activity

One of the task forces that worked with the Steering Council was the Employment (Job) Opportunity Taskforce. This group began meeting in early 1987, and focused on several objectives: 1) enhancing employment prospects for local residents through interactive, coordinated referral mechanisms; 2) maximizing the opportunity of local residents to secure employment associated with the expansion of Ft. Drum.

The task force was comprised of local employment and training offices, job services offices, private industry councils, union representatives, and Ft. Drum personnel.

This task force accomplished several programs and objectives during 1987. These include:

- o A marketing brochure to promote local services to contractors and the business community, and encouraged use of local residents in their employment needs;
- o Coordinated efforts with union representatives to prepare a realistic assessment of local resident employment opportunities;
- o Met with Morrison-Knudsen, the prime on-post contractor, to identify their need for local employees;
- o Maintained on-going contact of existing, local employer needs that occurred during the Ft. Drum expansion;
- o Recommended ways to improve the response process of local job services offices;
- o Developed a reporting instrument to reflect the status of the job market at time intervals.

Other activities included addressing long-term job placement in the community by targeting employer needs, and providing these employers with an adequately trained labor force which has occupational skills that meet their needs. It was through the activities of the employment opportunity task force that the activities of Small Business Development Center expanded in the target area to better address issues and opportunities of growth.

The existing Small Business Development Center in Watertown is one that is administered by the federal government and the State University of New York. It is one of 19 similar types of organizations that operate for small business development in New York. Initially, it was difficult to "sell" this concept to the

community. Jefferson Community College and the LDC had to convince leaders it was needed.

As its name indicates, the Small Business Development Center targets its efforts on growth opportunities for small businesses. Part of its mission is to build entrepreneurial spirit in a traditionally non-risk-taking environment. During the time of the military buildup, the staff had targeted their efforts at identifying prime and subcontractor opportunities that related to the post. After the expansion of the 10th Mountain Division was announced, the local agency staff spent time to prepare regional firms to compete for military-related business. These activities included teaching and instructing business in such requirements as bond, insurance and record keeping. During recent months, the staff has handled inquiries to buy existing businesses in the market. Another of their activities is to provide technical assistance for business start-ups.

The early activities for the Small Business Development Center were financed through a Department of Defense Grant for procurement activities, specifically the Defense Logistics Agency. With this initial money, the Center hired a staff person to begin carrying out its mission.

The Development Center has received a number of request-for-proposal specifics from the Fort Drum buildup. These were disseminated by the staff to ensure that local companies were aware of the opportunities. An effort to alert and educate local businesses came about as a result of a newsletter that was published by the Northern Builders Exchange. Local builders have been alerted to possibilities for construction contracts on the Fort.

The Business Center interfaced and coordinated with activities sponsored by the Steering Council. One example of this was a workshop and seminar sponsored to describe the buildup, the timing, and the military needs. The military provided staff to discuss specific happenings and the particular needs of the military. The event was sponsored by Congressman Martin, FDSC, and the Small Business Development Center and enabled local subcontractors to meet and talk with prime contractors concerning openings that they could fill. As a result of this effort, local businesses received some of the action and subcontracting dollars that passed through the project. The procurement conference was attended by over 700 local businessmen who heard how to do business with the federal government as well as with major contractors. SBDC followed up with local businesses.

The Center has also provided for individual counseling of small businesses. There are a number of requirements that businesses must meet to allow them to compete for federal jobs. The Center provided input on bonding, ways to secure credit lines, strategies and approaches to developing business marketing plans to secure loans, setup for payroll, certification for military activity, and minority certification qualifications.

During recent months the Center has conducted several feasibility studies. The first of these is a study of existing businesses to determine what types, sizes, and capabilities of business exist in the region. The second study was an economic analysis of the North Country economy to attempt to identify the types of businesses that were needed to complete a fairly well-rounded and comprehensive regional business environment. Finally, a study was done of local firms to identify their capabilities to handle new contracts issued by the military.

On an ongoing basis, the Business Center is conducting activities to continue to represent small businesses in the area. For example, the staff keeps abreast of the bidders list for military contracts and makes them available to local companies. The staff provides assistance to potential bidders to conform with the written requirements to obtain contracts, combined with ongoing technical assistance, to ensure business readiness -- that is, surety and compliance bonds -- so that when opportunities arise, they can be reacted to and responded to quickly. As well, the staff assists local firms in preparing business plans and pursuing loans.

The Center works through a number of existing incentives programs, for example, New York State's Urban Development Corporation, the federal government Small Business Administration, or the Department of Housing and Urban Development through the federal government. While the Center does not offer any of these grants directly, it provides the information necessary for local firms to secure their own financing. Additionally, the Center coordinates through the State, particularly Department of Economic Development programs, to ensure that the local community is competitive for these types of funding. Currently it is sponsoring a survey by the John Zogby Group to determine community attitudes with respect to the benefits and problems of the recent military buildup; and to identify the businesses which operate in the region and what support services are needed by existing business to operate more effectively.

Job Training Partnership

Fort Drum's buildup brought about a need for substantial job training. The in-place program is closely coordinated with JCEDC and JCIDA. The objective of the Job Training Partnership is to

provide training services for those in the North Country area who are currently unemployed. The Partnership also provides job services delivery for people who have jobs already, but are seeking to upgrade their employment. A portion of the job training activity is directed toward training people who will be replacing those who have shifted out of existing jobs. The training program offers qualified employees for existing and new job openings. Funding for these activities is directly from the Job Training Partnership Act through the federal government. Because of specifics in the JTPA program, the act requires that all recipients of training be either lower income or disadvantaged people -- specifically those who face barriers to employment.

To effectively carry out their responsibilities, the JTPA staff locally conducted a 1985 employer survey of needs. This survey provided them the input needed to set up job training programs that would meet the specifications of local business. As a result of this survey, the staff has targeted specific types of training programs to be established locally. To implement these targeted programs, the JPTA people work through the local institutions. (The chart on the following page shows the delivery format.) Specifically they have worked with the Jefferson Community College to establish classes which offer the needed training. To place their trained candidates, the Partnership has obtained on-the-job training contracts with local businesses and has placed candidates within these programs. By working in an existing environment, people get the training needed to be employed successfully. A partial reimbursement is made to the employer for the costs that are incurred during the employment. The program has also been funded for several of the BOCES (Board of Cooperative Education Services). As well, they have acted as a local clearinghouse for job opportunities for those who are out of work and are looking to be employed, the office as a "one-stop-shop" for people looking for employment.

From our interview with the staff, we learned that since the JTPA has been in place, several thousand fewer people in the community are on welfare. Local employers indicate that their needs for employees and skills have been fulfilled. The activities have recapitalized themselves through their ongoing activity -- with employers carrying part of the training costs.

Other Local Activities

Economic development not directly related to the buildup of Ft. Drum has occurred in the impact area. For example, the Jefferson County Industrial Development Authority has issued at least ten industrial revenue bonds for business development activity. During the Ft. Drum buildup, the region has suddenly taken on a new allure to people from the outside. The influx of new people and new talent has developed a can-do atmosphere. New businesses want to locate in Jefferson County, and the availability of industrial revenue bond financing combined with affordable land and trained labor makes this possible. In addition, the North Country Alliance regional marketing strategy has served as a springboard for community self-planning. Each of the three counties are developing their own marketing and promotional strategies, under the auspices of the umbrella NCA program. Efforts are beginning to revitalize downtown Watertown, which has declined over the years.

An unwritten mission of the Ft. Drum Steering Council has been to posture the area for long-term economic growth. The Development Authority of the North Country has been a catalyst to renewed efforts, offering certain powers to carry out new programs. However, the existing industrial authorities have been given first crack; while they are the preferred implementor, DANC remains a

forceful alternative way to carry out activities if they are not done locally. It was seen as critical by the community leadership that the magnitude of opportunity offered by the Fort Drum buildup would be capitalized on. As this chapter indicates, a variety of programs were conceptualized and implemented.

Local leaders believe that the housing stock expansion that has come directly as a result of Fort Drum is an economic development asset. New community housing has been one of the key catalysts, bringing about a change in climate in the overall market. (801 housing was an indirect encouragement to economic growth. It brought more stable tax post contribution which created an environment for other development.) Not only are there jobs for ambitious young families, there is also readily-available housing for them. No longer is there a potential long wait for accommodations for civilian households moving into the region. With the development of infrastructure which has been discussed in some detail, the Watertown area can accommodate new economic growth. As well, these facilities have allowed for affordable, new housing development.

Army Role

Directly and indirectly, the Army has had a role in the economic development of the North Country. For example, the Army would have preferred to have the infrastructure facilities on post, specifically sewage treatment and the water treatment. However, local leaders requested that the Army consider putting these facilities off-post so that they could be a foundation for the economic development of the region. The Army benefitted by not having to capitalize these facilities directly; the community is benefitting by having most of the capital and operating costs paid by the Army. This agreement, though not unprecedented, is

atypical; however it has been one of the cornerstones of the workable solutions reached by the Army and the community, contributing substantially to the positive feeling about the Army in the impact area.

The Army also provided a role in the job development efforts that were being conducted by local people. An example of this was the Industry Day that was held to discuss Army contracts with local contractors. The representatives from the Army presented the specific requirements that local businesses would need to meet to compete for particular pieces of the larger jobs. The Army also encouraged the large post construction contractors to subcontract to local firms in order to provide local jobs.

Chapter V

LAND USE

A. INTRODUCTION

Land use policy decisions are an important element of growth management planning. Traditional practice emphasizes regulation through zoning and subdivision controls.

In 1984, when the Fort Drum expansion was announced, many towns and associated villages were without planning boards and zoning commissions. Zoning and subdivision regulations either did not exist and/or required amendment; comprehensive plans were either "old" or did not exist. A number of specific ordinances and codes were outdated and regulations were considered essential in response to the expansion announcement and anticipated growth concerns, e.g., a mobile homes law, sign law, building and sanitary codes, flood plain regulations, and site plan review. However, few jurisdictions had the resources to respond to these requirements; there was a lot to accomplish in a short time.

B. ISSUES ANTICIPATED

Many of the jurisdictions within the Fort Drum Impact Area were aware that they were unprepared for the development which was anticipated as a result of the expansion process. These communities required technical assistance to help them regulate and control growth within their areas. Nevertheless, local funds to hire trained staff were insufficient. Moreover, qualified professionals were generally not available within the region and jurisdictional capabilities to recruit such staff were undeveloped. Finally, jurisdictions had previously not had many reasons to

cooperate with one another regarding planning/land use issues. Therefore, an established information network did not exist.

Communities also feared a number of negative impacts that are typically associated with unregulated change and, in particular, with the military. These issues, primarily related to land use, included:

- o The uncontrolled growth of commercial development along highways (i.e., strip development).
- o The proliferation of adult entertainment establishments.
- o The expanded development of mobile home parks.
- o The lack of adequate and affordable housing.
- o The increase in traffic.
- o The loss of the rural character of the region.

C. ACTIONS TAKEN

1. Land Use Task Force

Late in 1984, the Land Use Task Force was formed as one of the working groups of the Fort Drum Steering Council (FDSC). Immediately after the September, 1984 announcement, the various County and State planning agencies began to receive numerous requests for assistance in the development of land use controls from local jurisdictions. The Task Force, in turn, took two actions:

- o It requested that the Fort Drum Steering Council seek State funds to help provide the planning resources needed.
- o It began to formulate the concept of a Land Use Team

which was capable of providing technical assistance to the impacted communities in all three counties.

In addition, the Land Use Task Force established early contact with Army planners to discuss the potential physical impacts of the expansion on local communities. The Army provided information regarding negative impacts that had occurred as a result of other post expansions, as well as suggestions on how these might be minimized. In addition, several civilian employees of Fort Drum served on the Land Use Task Force.

2. Land Use Team

With the increasing number of requests for land use assistance from towns and villages, the Land Use Task Force asked Governor Cuomo for supplemental funding in order to create a Land Use Team. In March, 1985, Governor Cuomo pledged \$125,000 annually through the Department of State for this planning effort. The local jurisdictions agreed to match that amount through the provision of staff, equipment, and funds. The Temporary State Commission (TSC) on Tug Hill, an existing State entity which had been providing technical planning assistance to 39 towns in North Central New York for over ten years via a system of circuit riders, was designated to receive State funds and to hire and deploy the planning staff.

In New York State, temporary State commissions are exempt from many of the spending procedures and restrictions that apply to the State's Executive Departments. The Temporary State Commission on Tug Hill proved very useful in implementing the Governor's pledge of \$125,000. Within two months, the Commission was able to hire and deploy staff using its regular appropriation, even though the actual transfer of funds did not occur until September, 1985. By using the budgetary flexibility associated with temporary State

commissions, the Task Force was able to respond very rapidly to the needs of the towns and villages.

While the Land Use Task Force served as the planning policy group, the Land Use Team became the local assistance group. In June, 1985, the Task Force submitted a Regional Land Use Policy Statement to the FDSC. This document was intended to serve as a guide for the Land Use Team as it worked with the municipalities.

The Land Use Team has functioned as "a loose federation of agencies whose common purpose is to deliver technical assistance to town and village governments within the thirty mile radius impact area (of Fort Drum)." The focus has been on building the capacity to do comprehensive community planning and to implement plans through regulatory and other programs. The Team sponsors included the Department of State (Office of Local Government Services); the TSC on Tug Hill; the Jefferson, St. Lawrence, and Lewis County Planning Departments; and the Drum Area Council of Governments (DACOG). Other participants included town planners from Carthage/Wilna and Philadelphia (see attached organizational chart entitled "Accountability of the Tug Hill Commission in Relation to Fort Drum Impact Area.").

The initial objective of the Land Use Team was to enable towns and villages within the Impact Area to implement planning through the adoption of land use laws and regulations. Acting as a facilitator, the Land Use Team conducted meetings with town and village officials to inform them about the issues and the possible techniques for responding to those issues, as well as to help those officials establish their own community goals. In addition the Team provided technical assistance in the following areas:

- o Preparation and adoption of land use plans on a "fast-track" basis

- o Revision of zoning laws
- o Review of developers' site plans
- o Assistance with grant applications

In addition, as a representative of the Impact Area communities in all three counties, the Land Use Team served as a management group, defining and working through the appropriate roles and relationships between the counties and the State regulatory agencies such as DEC, DOH, and DOT.

Finally, the Land Use Team initiated many specific activities and programs including technical assistance newsletters, training sessions for public officials, and the formation of Regional Project Review Teams.

Staff members of the State-funded portion of the Land Use Team have now been absorbed into the Tug Hill Commission and the County planning departments and are paid for by funds regularly appropriated to those agencies.

3. Drum Area Council of Governments

With the formulation of the Fort Drum Steering Council (FDSC) in late 1984, the towns and villages which were not included as part of that membership expressed concern regarding their exclusion. In response to that concern, the towns and villages of Jefferson County formed a new organization, the Drum Area Council of Governments (DACOG).

Initially, DACOG helped to inform town and village officials about Fort Drum-related issues and, similar to the Land Use Team, helped these communities to identify their own short- and long-term planning needs. Later, DACOG organized forums to discuss broader

local community issues and helped introduce the assistance of the Land Use Team in member communities.

Because DACOG was formed as a reaction to the Steering Council, it did not work well with that body and has often worked in opposition to it. A broader representation on the FDSC, or the formation of a Local Government Task Force might have negated the need for a DACOG, and might have allowed a more positive working relationship between the FDSC and the towns and villages. This, in turn, might have helped to alleviate issues that later developed, especially with regard to negotiating PILOT agreements for the Army's 801 projects.

DACOG, as an organization, ceased to function in early 1990.

4. Growth of Planning Staff

As a result of the Fort Drum expansion process, local jurisdictions, particularly at the County level, have developed the capabilities to plan and direct future growth. The Jefferson County Planning Department has grown from a staff of six in 1984 to 14 in 1989. Lewis County initially contracted with the Tug Hill Commission to hire a Land Use Team planner to serve its municipalities. On April 1, 1988, the County subsequently created a Planning Department and put its Land Use Team Planner on its own payroll as Planning Director. One year later, Lewis County added a second planner.

St. Lawrence County had an established Planning Department prior to the expansion process. The planning staff was expanded by the addition of a cartographer, paid, in part, through a three-year grant of Land Use Team funds. It is not clear, however, that this expansion can be attributed to the Fort Drum expansion.

The City of Watertown hired its first planner in 1985. Prior to that time, planning efforts were coordinated through the City's Engineering Department. When the expansion process began, Watertown already had some land use regulations in place, unlike other communities in the impact area. The City presently has a planning staff of three and is attempting to complete a Land Use Plan and an updated Zoning Ordinance.

Philadelphia has established a part-time planning position within the Town; the village has hired a part-time grants administrator/planner. Carthage and Wilna are presently sharing a full-time planner and have been doing so since 1985.

5. Regulatory Actions

The long-term goal of the Land Use Team was to help establish the capabilities of local governments to plan and control growth. The immediate need was to ensure that development associated with the Fort Drum expansion was appropriately accommodated.

The land use effort is viewed as successful, especially given the accelerated pace of development. Immediately following the decision to expand Fort Drum, several towns within Jefferson County enacted interim laws prior to passing zoning laws. Specific legislation included subdivision control, site plan review, sanitary codes, and mobile home laws. These laws were typically passed within two to four months, including public hearings. Between April, 1985 (the initiation of the Fort Drum Land Use Team) and November, 1986, local governments amended and/or adopted approximately seventy land use laws. The following are examples of these efforts, taken from Land Use Team Progress Reports:

- o Shortly after the announcement of Fort Drum's expansion, Brownville prepared and adopted a site plan review law, sanitary codes, and subdivision regulations. The individuals that prepared these regulations became the Town's planning board. Working with the Fort Drum Land Use Team, they also prepared a master plan that involved assistance from the local high school, St. Lawrence University, and the Jefferson County Planning Department.
- o The Town of Gouverneur in St. Lawrence County prepared and adopted a zoning law in forty-two days (May, 1985). This included creating a zoning commission, completing the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) process, and all required public hearings.
- o Out of the requirement for a comprehensive plan to precede the adoption of land use regulations, the newly formed town planning board of the Town of Champion, together with Land Use Team planners, conducted a goals exercise in July, 1985, to establish priorities for future actions. The first priority was the adoption of tighter land use controls; the second was "comprehensive planning to manage growth." At a meeting on September 18, 1985, reports were presented to officials in the areas of code revisions, sewage/water/solid waste, transportation and land use, recreation/open space, and school/fire/police services. After that meeting, Champion successfully accomplished the adoption of a new zoning law that included natural resource protection districts and site plan review, and the adoption of new subdivision regulations.

Almost all of the communities within the Fort Drum Impact Area presently have zoning laws and land use regulations, as well as

Planning Boards and Zoning Boards of Appeal. Although not all of the new development has resulted in products the planners may have hoped for, communities have been able to direct development in their areas. Generally, the original fears did not materialize. For example, following the Fort Drum announcement, all local jurisdictions incorporated mobile home regulations as part of their site plan review process and, following adoption of zoning, limited the location of mobile parks. Hence, this potential problem never became an issue.

In 1988, the Tug Hill Commission, with extensive input from the rest of the Land Use Team, produced a development guide, the Guide to Land Development, Permits, Procedures, Community Planning and Design. This document includes:

- o A guide to permits
- o Administrative guidelines for local planning and zoning
- o A project review guide

As a result of the expansion process, a planning network presently exists and jurisdictions have learned to work together to solve common problems. This is, perhaps, the most significant accomplishment of the process.

D. FUTURE NEEDS

1. Defining the Counties' Planning Roles vis a vis Local Communities

The Counties have recently begun to assume a greater responsibility for community assistance in planning. Early in the expansion process, the goal had been to build up local planning capabilities and then allow these communities to function on their

own. As the process has progressed, however, it has become evident that a stronger coordinating role on the part of the counties may be desirable for technical and financial reasons, and in order to effectively address the broader County-wide issues. The Local Government Management Study of 1989 supports this approach. Nevertheless, how the County/Town/Village relationship works itself out has not yet been fully resolved.

With the demise of DACOG, its role as a networking mechanism for towns and villages has ended. On January 31, 1990, twelve villages in Jefferson County approved an agreement for the reactivation of a Village Association. This organization had been in existence in Jefferson County prior to the expansion; it did not, however, function during the expansion process. No commitment from other communities has been made regarding this effort to date.

2. Addressing Regional Issues

Beyond County-wide concerns are the larger, regional-scale issues which must be addressed. Transportation problems, for example, must be considered on a regional as well as a local level because local regulations effect regional needs.

The Tug Hill Commission is beginning to shift its planning focus to a more regional scale. It will offer training workshops for the entire Fort Drum Impact Area and will offer technical expertise in addressing regional issues.

3. Expanding the Local Planning Focus

With land use regulations in place, many communities are beginning to turn their attention to other types of planning

issues. The City of Watertown Department of Planning is beginning to focus its efforts on downtown redevelopment and historic preservation/restoration issues within its neighborhoods. Other communities are discussing the need for park and open space recreation plans, beautification plans, etc. In addition, many of the jurisdictions do not have long-term comprehensive plans to guide and direct change in the future.

Communities have expressed concern regarding the financial and technical resources needed to address these issues. The continued availability of State funding to the Tug Hill Commission to assist communities outside its traditional 39-town region is unknown. Communities will have to address other means for funding and staffing these activities. This promises to be a difficult, long-term issue for the area.

Chapter VI

EDUCATION

A. INTRODUCTION

Growth impacts from the Fort Drum expansion cannot be analyzed as isolated phenomena. Impacts are linked together and influence each other in complex ways. Education is a perfect example of this. Planning for growth in the educational system was strongly shaped by the evolution of the 801 housing schedule, both in terms of timing and the location of the housing. To the extent that the 801 housing became a complex issue, education planning was affected as well.

Other linkages also existed. School enrollment increases implied social changes within a well-established community network. Although these changes did not, in many cases, result in the problems that were anticipated, a flexible planning style ensured responsiveness to changing educational needs. Issues such as budgeting, facilities development, cultural awareness, special education, screening for placement, curriculum transfer, and English as a Second Language were handled effectively. Actions and programs such as intercultural awareness workshops, new counselors and staff, a shared student screening system, new curriculum, a tutor training program, and a "buddy system" were creative responses that were generally well received.

Institutions of higher education worked in a cooperative manner with the military, and developed programs which would better serve the changing needs of a growing population. A consortium of SUNY Colleges was formed to coordinate expanded coursework and teaching opportunities. There are still several issues remaining to be addressed, including continued communication with the Army

after the sunset of the Steering Council, future adjustments to school district boundaries in the event of further growth, and lobbying for State and Federal funds.

B. ISSUES ANTICIPATED

1. Population Predictions

Predictions of a sudden massive build-up at Fort Drum were of great concern to the school authorities in the North Country communities. In particular, the development of 801 housing sites was anticipated as having a significant impact on the communities in which they were located. While the 801 housing might, theoretically, have been distributed evenly among the different school districts to avoid a massive impact on any one district, transportation infrastructure and the social needs of Army families worked against this being a practical option.

Communication between the military and the community, as well as inter-Task Force communication, was essential as this process unfolded.

2. Budgeting Issues

It was also anticipated that funding delays would create problems. State financial aid to school districts is tied to current, not future, enrollments. Thus, for example, a large enrollment increase in the first five attendance periods for one year does not result in increased funding until the following year. This fact deters proactive planning. Within the Impact Area, school districts were faced with difficulties in getting local taxpayers to approve tax increases for new facilities. Many

citizens were not convinced that the growth would actually occur. They, therefore, were reticent to vote increases until they saw that a significant number of students were coming into their area.

The fact that there was not a huge surge in enrollment at one time made it more difficult for the districts to convince taxpayers that the new students were, in fact, on their way. And, in fact, in some jurisdictions, the anticipated growth never did occur to the extent planned for. The City of Watertown, for example, was left short \$300,000 in Federal aid due to unrealized enrollment; some of the money had already been spent in preparation for the anticipated increases. At the same time, Indian River realized only one half of its expected enrollment in 1988, but eventually did reach the enrollment it had anticipated. Such uncertainty made it difficult to plan curriculum, spatial needs, special education programs, staffing, and so on.

3. Inadequate Facilities, Staff, and Equipment

Many school districts were faced with inadequate facilities, including buildings which required major renovations and expansion. Increased State facility standards, teacher and staff shortages, inadequate equipment, and a lack of space were also projected. These physical shortages needed to be addressed prior to any focus on program development.

Recruitment of teachers and support staff was viewed as a critical issue. Many of the positions anticipated would be new ones for a number of the school districts. These included counselors, psychologists, occupational and physical therapists, and English as a Second Language (ESL) tutors.

4. Ethnic Diversity

The unique characteristics of military children would pose new challenges for the school systems. It was expected that there would be culture shock for both the new students and the local students. The North Country was comprised predominantly of a white population that was, before the expansion, extremely stable. The makeup of classes did not change from year to year. It was said that teachers could tell in a Kindergarten class who the class valedictorian was going to be. The curriculum had been designed to meet the individual needs of small classes.

With the influx of new students from different parts of the world, it was expected that there would be a difficult transition. New students would bring new talents, new perspectives, new cultures, and even different languages. Approximately thirty percent of military personnel are non-white. There was concern that racial conflict would occur. It did not.

5. Special Program Requirements

With a broad diversity of new students, school districts anticipated the need for a wide range of new and special programs. For example, it was expected that the schools would have to provide ESL courses. In addition, with a significant increase in the number of students, a rise in the number of students with physical and mental handicaps was also anticipated. Special classes, equipment, and staff would be required to accommodate these needs. Moreover, it was difficult for the schools to plan ahead for these special needs students since it was impossible to predict the possible handicap conditions that might occur.

Finally, school districts found that military families who had lived in other parts of the United States where these and other special programs were already in place were sometimes intolerant of the delays in the start-up of such programs in the schools of the Impact Area.

6. Placement Screening

It was felt that rapid growth would strain the placement screening system and would create extensive paper work. In fact, the accommodation of military students did place an additional burden on the student screening system in some school districts, due to the frequent turnover of military families. School districts had to work out a process that would allow an efficient technique for student placement screening.

This problem was further compounded by the fact that New York State establishes fairly rigorous requirements for its students. Military students who had been in school in other parts of the United States or overseas did not always satisfy the New York State standards. This was anticipated to be a serious problem, particularly for secondary school students.

7. Dividing the Post for School Districts

A major issue for the education community centered on the question of where to draw the dividing line on-Post for the school districts. Army authorities wanted to avoid splitting each of the housing areas into several school districts. The solution was to follow the old district lines established in the 1940s, but to modify these to equitably divide the new housing developments.

Another issue surfaced when Fort Drum offered a piece of on-Post land to the Indian River School District for a school and a school bus depot. It was subsequently discovered that Niagara Mohawk Company was planning to run a transmission line through the site. The Army tried to either get assurances that the line would not pose health or safety risks for the children or convince Niagara Mohawk to relocate the line. Niagara Mohawk would not move the line and claimed it would pose no risks. Consequently, the Indian River school authorities refused the site.

8. Higher Education Issues

Following the announcement of the proposed expansion of Fort Drum, Jefferson Community College (JCC) initiated a series of planning activities to prepare for the changes that were expected. The JCC Academic Dean and the Dean of Continuing Education met with Fort Drum's Educational Services Officer to discuss the "phase-in" plan for the 10th Infantry Division and determine the educational backgrounds and needs of the incoming soldiers and their families. Other SUNY and private sector two- and four-year colleges were included in the planning activities. These initiatives were especially significant because of the projected lack of higher educational opportunities in the local area. SUNY colleges would need to expand course offerings and supplement equipment and classroom space, all of which would require funding. Timing of the changes would be critical.

C. ACTIONS TAKEN

1. Funding/Budgets

Area school districts sought funding from all potential sources to support enrollment increases. Two million three hundred thousand dollars were received from New York State in special Fort Drum impact aid for six districts in 1986-1987. This significant initiative enabled the school districts to prepare for the expansion. Special aid was distributed annually (e.g., 1986-87: \$2.3 million; 1987-88: \$2.3 million; 1988-89: \$2.5 million; 1989-90: \$2.5 million) according to a formula which was tied to anticipated buildup. This aid will decrease with the concurrent decrease in the overall impact aid to the Fort Drum area.

There are two types of Federal aid appropriated annually by Congress that can be sought to help educate military children. The first type, "A" aid, is intended for children of Federal employees who live on Federal property. The second type, "B" aid, is for children of both military and civilian employees who work on Federal property, but live off post. When at least twenty percent of the student population in a given school district is comprised of either type "A" or "B" students, they are considered eligible for "Super A" or "Super B" funds, respectively. "Super A" funding is substantial. While it can vary from year to year, a school district eligible for such aid can receive approximately \$2,500 to \$3,000 per student. "Super B" aid provides approximately \$25 to \$30 per student.

Only the Indian River and Carthage School Districts service on-post students. Therefore, they are the only districts eligible to receive type "A" aid. However, thus far, neither has achieved "Super A" status, although Indian River will probably become a

"Super A" district in 1990-1991. It is doubtful, however, that Indian River will be able to maintain this status due to the large amount of off-post construction occurring in that district.

Watertown and Carthage both achieved "Super B" status in 1989-90. However, this funding is highly unpredictable from year to year.

2. Capital Improvements

Before curriculum could be addressed, basic spatial needs had to be determined. Existing buildings in all school districts required renovation and additions to accommodate growth. As of August, 1989, \$51,163,000 in Capital Improvements Projects had been allocated in the combined districts. The individual district expenditures were as follows:

Carthage	\$13,100,000
Indian River	21,638,000
Watertown	3,325,000
Thousand Island	5,200,000
General Brown	6,600,000
Lowville	1,300,000

3. Cultural and Ethnic Diversity

A creative and enlightened proactive strategy was set in motion to try to circumvent anticipated problems related to racial tension. First, a series of intercultural workshops were held. Several schools developed staff in-service training sessions which dealt with issues related to an anticipated multiracial school population. There was also a series of workshops specifically

geared for military families. Finally, an induction/welcome package was prepared by some schools which included a "buddy system" for new students. Each new student was paired with a returning student or "buddy" who helped him/her become acclimated to a new school environment. This program was very successful. As a result of this forethought and planning, the schools experienced almost no incidents of racial conflict.

4. Staff Recruitment

Perhaps more fundamental changes occurred in the area of recruitment and staffing. Not only was there a need for more teachers and staff, but aggressive recruiting was required to ensure quality personnel and to fill specialized roles. Special guidance counselors, ESL tutors, and other necessary staff were hired. ESL programs and a tutor training program were started. Salary increases for teachers and support staff were critical to the effective recruitment strategy.

5. Curriculum Development

An effort was made to shape the curriculum to meet the needs of the new and diverse student body. Each school approached this issue individually. However, ideas were shared through regular meetings called by the Superintendent of the Board of Cooperating Educational Services (BOCES). Sequencing and pacing of programs were brought more in line with national standards and structures to facilitate a logical transition for the new students. The influx of new students was viewed as a positive occurrence. Many of the incoming students were bright, enthusiastic, and competitive, sparking a dynamic learning environment. A program for exceptional students was created to challenge these children.

To help students understand the unique perspectives of the new student population, a curriculum on Army families was developed for grades K-9.

Throughout the growth period, the military worked closely with all of the school districts, through the Garrison Commander, to inform the schools about what to expect with regard to military children and what kinds of skills military spouses were likely to have (e.g., teachers, nurses, etc.)

6. School Health Program Development

Several health-related programs were instituted by some of the schools. A school health questionnaire study was conducted in conjunction with the Community Health Services Committee of the Health Care Task Force to determine if current health needs were being met. A Resource Procedures Manual was developed for school nurses to help standardize procedures. There were two alcohol/drug abuse-related programs already in place before the expansion that took on increased significance: "Project Charlie" for grades K-6 and "Horizons" for grades 7-12.

7. The SUNY Consortium

Actions taken by institutions of higher education were instrumental in responding to the needs of the evolving population. Chief among these was the formation of a Consortium of SUNY colleges to coordinate expanded coursework and new teaching opportunities. On November 5, 1984, Jefferson Community College hosted a meeting of academic officers from several upstate SUNY colleges. Included in this meeting were representatives from SUNY Oswego, Potsdam, College of Technology, Canton ATC, Delhi ATC,

Empire State, and Jefferson, as well as SUNY Central Administration. Representatives endorsed the proposal to establish a SUNY-Fort Drum/North Country Educational Services Consortium. On January 10 and 11, 1985, in Potsdam, a meeting was held to develop a set of operating principles for the Consortium. The following principles were agreed upon:

Initially, the Consortium would provide campus-postd degree programs from its various participating institutions. Each institution would award its own degrees. The primary instruction site would be Fort Drum.

Associate Degree programming would be the responsibility of Jefferson Community College, Canton Agricultural and Technical College, Delhi Agricultural and Technical College, and Empire College, with other Consortium institutions supporting these efforts as appropriate.

Normally, lower division courses would be provided by the two-year institutions except when courses or faculty resources were not available through those institutions to meet curricular or enrollment needs.

The Consortium also presented a proposal on curriculum to Fort Drum's Educational Services Officer outlining certificate, two-year, four-year, and graduate programming available to the Fort and community. A search for a Director of the Consortium ended in April, 1985 when its first Director was officially instated.

The Consortium represented an important gesture of welcome to the expanded military community. It served as a significant effort to meet the changing needs of a major new employer. Planning

efforts were justified when enrollments increased at the various institutions. Jefferson Community College had a 13 percent increase in enrollment for full-time students and a 51 percent increase for part-time students from 1984 to 1989. The educational needs of Fort Drum have been primarily satisfied by the two-year programs, while area residents have been most interested in the three- and four-year programs.

D. FUTURE NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED

The recruitment and retention of valuable teachers and support staff are ongoing concerns. In particular, it has been difficult to retain special education teachers. The SUNY Consortium may help temper this problem by expanding its graduate course offerings. There is still no Master of Social Work degree offered. If growth continues, future adjustments of school boundaries may be required using tax maps, etc. This can be a very sensitive issue. Funding strategies are still an issue. Continuing the proactive lobbying effort, as well as seeking funds at both the State and Federal levels, are necessary. It will become increasingly difficult to maintain funding levels due to the leveling off of the expansion, as well as the State and Federal budget constraints. As the North Country shifts into a maintenance period, the local tax burden will begin to be an issue.

It will become necessary to maintain positive communication between the community and the Army to address all of these issues. In the past, the Fort Drum Steering Council has provided this link. With the phase-out of that organization, the school districts have not considered any alternative strategies for maintaining communication with their Army counterparts. This is an issue which needs to be addressed.

Chapter VII

HEALTH CARE

A. INTRODUCTION

The delivery of health care services to both Army personnel and their dependents as well as to non-military community residents was a major concern of all parties involved in planning the Fort Drum expansion. At a time when the Army was actively seeking ways to reduce the very large Fort Drum construction budget, and the community was under pressure from New York State because of its underutilization of hospital beds, a cooperative agreement between the Army and the community appeared to be the most logical and advantageous solution.

The plan that was developed has become a model of military-community cooperation. It appears to be serving both the military and civilian communities well and, in some instances, has broken new ground for the Army in terms of establishing new and more flexible health care programs for soldiers and their families.

B. ISSUES ANTICIPATED

1. Treatment of Military Families On- versus Off-Post

Historically, Fort Drum had maintained a small clinic on-Post to serve the 1,000 military personnel stationed there on a full-time basis, as well as the Army Reservists who were on-Post only during summers. This clinic was operated under the medical command at Fort Devens, Massachusetts.

In planning the expansion of Fort Drum, the Army initially

decided to construct a 90-bed hospital on the Post. This plan conformed to the Army tradition of providing most medical services for military personnel and dependents at Army facilities.

At the same time, several of the hospitals in the communities surrounding Fort Drum were being told by New York State that they had to reduce their number of hospital beds due to low utilization rates (see below for a more detailed discussion of this issue). During the period when the Pentagon was studying options of where to locate the new Light Infantry Division, the local community, through Representative Martin in Washington, D.C. and during the Environmental Impact Hearing in Watertown, informed the Army of the availability of hospital beds and services in the North Country area.

When the decision was made to locate the new Division at Fort Drum, the community was concerned about the impact of this decision on the health care system of the impact area, and wanted to find a way to encourage the Army to use the community's services to the greatest extent possible.

2. Shortage of Health Care Professionals

There was concern, both on the part of the community and the Army, that if the latter were to decide to make optimal use of community health care services, there would be an insufficient number of physicians, nurses, and aides to serve this expanded population. Issues of recruitment and training became, therefore, immediate concerns of the health care planners.

3. Need for Primary Care Programs

Since it was anticipated that many of the soldiers in the new Division would be young and would have small children, the availability of primary care programs in the community emerged as a critical issue. This included programs for prenatal care, neonatal care, infant and child care, and school health care.

4. Hospital Bed Reductions

In 1983, the Central New York Health Systems Agency (CNYHSA) found an excess of 93 beds in the hospitals of Jefferson and Lewis Counties. CNYHSA asked the Jefferson-Lewis Hospital Executive Council (HEC) to immediately reduce the number of beds by 67, and to complete the remaining 26-bed reduction by 1985. The State later updated the method by which it measures "bed need" and projected an excess bed level in the region of 174 by 1990.

In 1984, the Jefferson-Lewis Hospital Executive Council, supported by the U.S. Army, and the Fort Drum Steering Council requested that CNYHSA delay its planned bed decertification until the community had had a chance to work out a medical care delivery system with the Army, and could then assess the long-term impacts of that relationship on the community's hospital needs.

In December, 1984, the Capital Investment Committee of CNYHSA approved the HEC's request to delay decertification until June 1, 1985. The HEC was asked to submit a report by that date addressing the long-range impacts of the Fort Drum expansion.

This issue placed considerable pressure on the community to work out a joint Army-community medical care system, and to do so as quickly as possible.

5. Need to Expand Dental Care

One of the major physician shortages found in the Fort Drum Impact Area was dentists. The need for expanded dental care was particularly acute for low income children. In addition, it was found that some communities did not have adequate levels of fluoride in their water systems.

6. Need for Improved Emergency Medical Services

Once the decision was made to distribute 801 Army housing units throughout the Impact Area, the Army became concerned about the adequacy of emergency medical services in those areas. It was noted that some smaller communities had no emergency equipment, while others had equipment that was out of date. This issue was a concern to community health care providers as well, particularly given the geographic spread of the region and the rural isolation of some residents.

7. Shortage of Health Care Services to Indigent and Medicare Populations

With an anticipated increase in the region's population and income, and a limited number of physicians, health care providers expressed concern that indigent populations and those on Medicare would be overlooked or would not be able to compete for adequate medical attention. Although this was somewhat of a problem in the area prior to the expansion of Fort Drum, it was feared that the issue would only become more critical as the population and income of the area grew.

8. Shortage of Services to Isolated Populations

As was true for indigent and Medicare populations, the concern about health care service delivery for the more isolated residents within the Impact Area had been present prior to the Fort Drum expansion. These individuals include the elderly and those living in more rural areas; moreover, there is often considerable overlap between isolated and indigent populations.

Health care providers anticipated, however, that as the demand for medical care increased with the growth of population, these individuals would be even further removed from medical services due to the lack of widespread availability of the services, and the absence of public transportation.

9. Lack of Mental Health Facilities

The health care community identified the lack of adequate mental health facilities as one of the most critical shortages within the Impact Area. This was particularly true for children and families requiring counselling and other mental health treatment.

10. Increase in Sexually Transmitted Diseases

The health care community anticipated that, with the influx of a young, sexually active population (both of soldiers and construction workers), there would also be a significant increase in the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases. The community felt that a program of education and treatment was needed to address this issue.

11. Need for Transient Management Programs

After learning about the experiences of other communities which had undergone rapid growth, health care providers anticipated the need to plan for a major influx of transient individuals. Health concerns centered on emergency care, and the health cost burden on the community resulting from a large number of unemployed, uninsured individuals requiring medical attention.

12. Internal Agency Issues

a. Lack of Postline Data

In attempting to assess the impact of the Fort Drum expansion on the Impact Area, and by trying to plan for additional programs and services required, it was necessary to establish postline data regarding services already available in the community. This information had not been compiled at any time prior to the expansion, which made any accurate assessment of medical service need an impossible task.

b. Lack of Agency Network

To compound this planning problem, there had been very little networking or program coordination between the various health care organizations within the Impact Area prior to the expansion process. Many of these organizations had, in fact, been in competition with one another to attract a limited population, rather than working in a coordinated way to ensure an adequate distribution of programs and services. In planning for the expansion, many of these groups had to overcome an initial distrust before a cooperative planning effort could be achieved.

C. ACTIONS TAKEN

The Health Care Task Force was established by the Fort Drum Steering Council (FDSC) in 1984 to assess the impact of the expansion on the area's health care system. The Task Force appointed three subcommittees (i.e., the Community Health Services Committee, the Medical Subcommittee, and the Hospital Subcommittee) to address the critical issues presented above. The actions of the Task Force, between 1984 and 1989, are discussed below.

1. Treatment of Military Personnel/Families On- versus Off-Post

The final action which allowed for the provision of most of the medical care for military personnel and their dependents off-Post, involved three separate, but related, sets of decisions: (a) the decision regarding whether or not to build a major medical facility at Fort Drum; (b) the decision regarding how to insure off-Post medical care; and (c) the decision regarding how to adequately staff local facilities to meet the Army's needs. Each of these decisions will be discussed separately below.

a. Community-posted Services

In March, 1985, the Surgeon General of the Army recommended reducing the original hospital plans for Fort Drum. Under the new scenario, the Post would only have a ambulatory clinic which would serve military personnel and family members on an outpatient basis. All personnel and their dependents would be served on an inpatient basis in local hospitals. Personnel requiring long-term care were to be flown to other Army hospitals.

After much discussion, the Army found it to be infeasible to fly all those personnel requiring long-term care to distant facilities. The Army then turned to the community hospitals to fill most of its inpatient needs. As of early 1990, about 75 percent of active Fort Drum personnel requiring inpatient care received treatment in community hospitals; about 25 percent were sent to Army hospitals. Decisions regarding treatment at Army versus community hospitals appear to be based on the type of surgery and post-operative treatments required.

At the present time, a new Ambulatory Health Clinic is under construction at Fort Drum. The Army has also added small clinics to on-post family housing areas, as well as opening a troop medical clinic and troop dental clinic.

Despite the fact that the Army has stated repeatedly that it has no intention of building a hospital at Fort Drum, rumors regarding this have repeatedly circulated in the community. The FDSC has attempted to allay these fears by obtaining and publicizing high-level Army reassurances. Given the current Defense budget scenario, such concerns would seem to be groundless.

b. CHAMPUS

Once the Army had made the decision to make broad use of community medical services, the issue of payment for those services arose. The Army's goal was to make the health delivery system "as transparent to the soldier as if there were a hospital at Fort Drum."

Under the Army's typical CHAMPUS insurance plan, military personnel and dependents receive free medical care on-Post, but

have to pay \$100 per year per family and a 20 percent copayment for treatment off-Post. With the decision not to provide extensive health care services on-Post, the prospect of a family being forced to pay a significant amount of money per year for medical treatment under the CHAMPUS plan was seen as a potential problem.

In response to this, Fort Drum requested that the Army consider changing the CHAMPUS requirement in order to eliminate the copayment element (i.e., to have the Army agree to pay for 100 percent of the service). This change, it was discovered, would necessitate an amendment to U.S. Code 1076, the law which established CHAMPUS and which specified all of the CHAMPUS requirements. Such a change would require a vote of Congress.

In 1986, Congress approved a change to the CHAMPUS law, by establishing the possibility for CHAMPUS Demonstration Projects. The Fort Drum case was to be the first of these projects. Since then, other Demonstration Projects have been approved in other areas.

Under the new law, a Demonstration Project can be implemented for three years. At the end of that period, two additional one-year extensions can be granted, but only for clearly demonstrated causes. The Fort Drum CHAMPUS project was initially approved through September, 1989. It was later extended to September, 1990.

In 1986, 144 physicians in the Impact Area agreed to participate in the CHAMPUS reimbursement schedule; thereby agreeing to see military personnel and families under the CHAMPUS plan. In 1987, the dental CHAMPUS plan also went into effect.

In 1988, a representative of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs visited the FDSC and reported that CHAMPUS outpatient use rates at Fort Drum exceeded

national averages. While the national average for on- and off-Post treatment was 4.6 visits per year per eligible beneficiary, the Fort Drum rate was 8.2 annual visits for eligible beneficiary.

The Army continues to express concern about the costs of CHAMPUS at Fort Drum. This cost, however, must be weighed against the savings that the Army has realized by not having to construct, staff, and maintain a large medical complex at Fort Drum. It must also be weighed against the potentially significant decrease in inpatient costs precipitated by ready access to outpatient care.

Both Fort Drum and the community have expressed the belief that the CHAMPUS Demonstration Project has worked well, particularly in the area of preventative medicine. The community is concerned about the fate of the CHAMPUS project after September, 1990 and the impact on the medical community if the project were to be cancelled.

c. Army Physicians In Local Hospitals

The third element in the Army-community medical arrangement involved staffing local hospitals to the level needed to serve the rapidly expanding military community.

In 1985, the Army announced its plan to bring 15 to 20 family practitioners to the Fort Drum area in order to augment the local shortage of physicians. The Army requested that these doctors be allowed to treat military patients in local hospitals. In New York State, this would be a relatively simple procedure since State law does not require Army physicians to obtain New York State licenses in order to practice in local hospitals. In addition, the Gonzales Act, which precludes Army health care providers from being sued directly by any Army personnel or dependent, protects the

professional liability of the Army physician who sees military patients in local hospitals.

Initially, the physicians practicing within the Impact Area expressed concern about granting military physicians privileges in area hospitals. However, in 1986, the Jefferson County Medical Society agreed to support this action.

At present, approximately 15 Army physicians have medical privileges in area hospitals. Both the Army and the community seem to feel that this program has been very successful.

2. Shortage of Health Care Professionals

a. Physician Recruitment

In 1985, the Health Care Task Force conducted an inventory of physicians by specialty. The survey found 56.75 primary care physicians, 42.4 medical/surgical specialists, and 27.9 hospital-posted physicians, for a total of 127.05 physicians in the Impact Area.

As a result of the survey, the Task Force projected the need for 20 additional physicians, with obstetricians, family practitioners, and psychiatrists targeted as the highest priorities.

In 1986, the Task Force suggested establishing a revolving loan fund to assist physician recruitment efforts. This plan established a target of \$200,000 to be divided among four rural hospitals in the Impact Area. The money would be used to assist new physicians in the area with expenses while they established local practices. This program never materialized, due to New York

State unwillingness to fund it. However, a program entitled Physicians Alive is currently in operation. This program is funded jointly by several Watertown hospitals and physicians to support physicians entering the area who are not receiving support from any other source.

In 1988, the Task Force discussed the formation of a Cooperative Recruitment Committee to increase the involvement of medical resources and community leaders in physician recruitment and retention efforts. This Committee, however, never became active.

The Army has contributed significantly to the recruitment effort in several ways. First, through the practice of allowing Army physicians to practice in local hospitals, those facilities now have 15 additional physicians. However, these doctors can only treat Army personnel and dependents. The community can benefit in the long run, nevertheless, since several retiring Army physicians have chosen to remain and practice in the North Country.

b. Nurse Recruitment

In 1985, the Community Health Services Committee of the Health Services Task Force undertook a survey of nursing staff and found a serious regional shortage of nurses, particularly of those with baccalaureate degrees. At that time, New York State recommended that the area begin offering incentives for reeducation, continued education, and returning to work for those nurses who had left the workforce.

Jefferson Community College's Nursing Program reported a decline in both enrollments and graduates. Low salaries and poor benefits were believed to be factors related to this decline.

In 1987, the New York State Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) surveyed its own programs and found a shortage of Licensed Practical Nurses (LPNs) and health aides. They found, however, that the shortage of Registered Nurses (RNs) was most serious.

In addition, the Task Force recommended in 1987 that a cooperative recruitment effort for nurses be started, which would offer a central employment and referral source. This program has not materialized.

The Army has provided a source of nurses to the community through its military spouses. There are members of the community who believe that some nurses are leaving local jobs to take better paying ones at Fort Drum. However, others cite the additional supply of well qualified nurses that have been provided through the military spouse network. No quantifiable data is available to document either of these perceptions, or to indicate which has been the greater cost or benefit.

3. Primary Care Programs

In 1989, the House of the Good Samaritan (HGS) established a perinatal unit and a network care program in conjunction with Planned Parenthood (PPNY), North Country Children's Clinic (NCCC), and Public Health Nursing. The program employs nurse practitioners as part of its team. There was some controversy surrounding the establishment of this unit: HGS applied for State funding for the necessary expansion of the unit at the same time as Mercy Hospital

sought funding for its own neonatal unit. The Task Force voted to support the HGS application. However, the FDSC refused to support the application, thus establishing a policy of not supporting any single hospital in light of the Council's support for a cooperative planning study for all six area hospitals. This action was significant in that it was the first Council issue which required an individual voters tally of FDSC members. The Council did approve a resolution supporting the need for more neonatal intensive care beds for the entire Impact Area.

In 1988-89, the Jefferson County Prenatal Care Assistance Program expanded its patient load capacity from 115 to 150. This program was initially funded by the New York State Department of Health. However, the program will, in the future, be funded through Medicaid.

At the same time, the Public Health Infant Assistance Program received funding from Jefferson County for program development. Hepburn Hospital developed a Perinatal Clinic Service, and PPNY at Gouverneur began to establish a Prenatal Service. The latter program never became active.

In terms of other primary care services, NCCC was funded by New York State to increase its staff, and expand its Well Child Services and its car seat loan program. In 1989, New York State also gave the Jefferson County Public Health Service a two- to three-year grant for a poison prevention program. Money was made available to St. Lawrence County for this purpose as well.

Since schools can provide a significant role in primary health care, the Community Health Services Committee conducted a school survey in 1985-86 regarding the status of school health programs. The findings of the survey indicated that school nurses perceived that:

- a. Health education, training, and resource needs were not being met by the schools (e.g., CPR, counseling, respiratory assessments, orthopedic assessments, and hearing assessments);
- b. School age children had health problems which were neither being identified nor adequately treated; and
- c. School age children were not receiving regular primary preventative care.

4. Hospital Bed Decertification

In August, 1985, the Surgeon General of the Army informed Congressman Martin that the Area's excess bed capacity would be sufficient to meet the Army's projected needs over the long term and signaled the Army's intention to rely on local hospitals for inpatient care rather than build a hospital on-post. To support this, the Army asked New York State not to mandate reduction in the number of beds until the Fort Drum build-up was complete and long-term needs could be assessed. In November, 1985, the Governor assured Congressman Martin that he opposed "any immediate reduction in capacity" and that he would not require decertification of hospital beds until the full impact of Fort Drum expansion could be assessed. The State subsequently waived its bed utilization requirements in effect at the time because the Department of Defense, et.al., believed that when the full impact of the Fort Drum expansion was assessed, the occupancy levels would be met. Based on the State's determination that the hospitals could be paid at the higher reimbursement level, federal matching payments were also made at the higher rate. The Watertown hospitals relied on assurances from the State of New York that decertification of beds

was not required by them in order to receive the higher alternate level of care reimbursement. Therefore, excess beds were not decertified.

However, despite these assurances, in 1989, the area hospitals were informed that the State planned to begin withholding money due to the area's lack of compliance with its bed decertification order. Recoupment of federal over payments was also threatened. After a great deal of discussion with and complaints to State officials, the Governor's Office eliminated its mandated payment requirement; however, the hospitals may still be required to reimburse the Federal government for non-compliance with bed occupancy requirements.

5. Dental Care

The Jefferson-Lewis County Dental Society conducted a survey of dental services in the area, in 1985, and found that a critical shortage of dentists was not apparent. However, there was concern about dental care for the medically indigent and for those on Medicare.

Moreover, CHAMPUS had not traditionally covered dental care. While the Fort Drum dental clinic was to have 38 chairs, dependents would only be treated as space was available and only on a limited basis. CHAMPUS dental coverage for military families became an important issue. In 1987, dental care was included in the CHAMPUS program.

In 1986, Mercy Hospital submitted a grant application to the New York State Department of Health to cover start-up and administrative costs for a Primary Dental Health Care Clinic. In December, the first grant was received, and the program's first

dentist was hired in the Summer of 1987. By 1988, over 1,700 visits had been made to the Clinic.

The issue of fluoridation was not one that had been brought about as a result of the expansion. However, the expansion planning effort enabled the community to explore the extent of the problem and take action to resolve it. In 1985, a Dental Society survey revealed that few communities in the Impact Area had optimal levels of fluoride in their water systems. The FDSC informed DANC of this finding.

The American Dental Association and the American Medical Association offered technical and financial aid to communities choosing to fluoridate local water supplies. In addition, the New York State Department of Health committed to installing fluoridation equipment; however, the localities were told that they had to maintain the equipment. Finally, in 1987, the State was notified of a grant from the Bureau of Dental Health for fluoridation at the 801 Army housing sites in Clayton, Philadelphia, West Carthage, and Lowville.

6. Emergency Medical Services

Early in the planning process, the Health Care Task Force identified the need for emergency medical services (EMS) as "urgent." Of the 27 providers of EMS in the area, only 5 offered advanced EMS. The Task Force proposed expanding EMS training through an EMS Council. The cost estimate for the equipment needed for this effort was \$20,000.

In addition, the Army wished to have its EMS technicians trained locally, in order to comply with New York State standards. The Army offered to pay for this training. In 1988, the FDSC

received a \$60,000 grant from New York State for EMS training and equipment. The EMS Council appointed an EMS coordinator, and appointed four deputies as well. The number of EMS courses increased in 1988 from 8 to 30 per year.

The EMS program is discussed in greater detail in the Public Safety section of this report.

7. Health Care for Medically Indigent

In 1986, the FDSC endorsed a grant application to the New York State Department of Health/Division of Ambulatory Care Reimbursement to help establish primary care clinics for Medicaid recipients and the medically indigent. Clinics were to be located at North Country Children's Clinic and at Mercy Hospital. These programs were not funded, however.

In 1988, the Alcohol and Substance Abuse Council proposed to expand its education and prevention services to medically indigent persons. To date, there has been some expansion of the program in general, with an accompanying increase in staff. All services provided by the Council are free and the medically indigent continue to be a major focus of the program.

In 1989, the Task Force reported that health care for the medically indigent remained a "critical" issue, and acknowledged that a great deal more had to be accomplished in this area.

8. Health Care Services to Isolated Populations

Over the five-year planning period, the following actions were either proposed or taken to address health care services for the

elderly and for isolated rural populations:

- o Jefferson County Public Health Service began providing 24-hour Home Care Services.
- o Mercy Hospital, in 1988, became certified as a Home Health Agency to provide 24-hour home care services.
- o Samaritan-Keep Home, Henry Keep, and HGS submit an application to New York State for a 76-bed home for the elderly. This process was tabled, however, when mortgage problems developed for the proposed site of the home.
- o Jefferson County expanded its Adult Day Care program through Federal funding.

9. Mental Health Services

While the Task Force identified the lack of mental health services as one of the most serious needs for the community, this issue became one of the most difficult for which to obtain funding. This problem, it was felt by the Task Force, only worsened as a result of the expansion as gaps widened in the delivery of mental health services to children, youth, and families due to increased service demands from the military population.

The Army, in 1988, recognized its own inability to adequately address this problem. At the time, the Army reported that its mental health services were not "up to speed," and that it was not yet able to adequately address the needs of military dependents. Nevertheless, the Army reported that 25 percent of all Fort Drum CHAMPUS claims were for mental health treatment.

Several actions that were taken in response to this problem are as follows:

- o Recruitment of mental health staff. The area has been able to recruit several psychiatrists, a psychologist, and several social workers.
- o In 1988, the Community Mental Health Clinic expanded its staff and services. In 1990, this Clinic will expand once again.
- o Also in 1988, an outpatient clinic for male and female substance abusers was opened by the Credo Foundation. This was funded by the Council of Social Services and the United Way.
- o In addition, the Rose Hills adolescent resident program for substance abusers also opened in 1988.
- o There are plans to establish an additional Credo Foundation substance abuse program at Pamelia in 1990 if State funding can be obtained. Similarly, Jefferson County has had a plan for the past three years to provide a residence for female alcoholics; it is felt that there is a 50 percent chance of this program being funded in 1990. Finally, there are plans to establish a certified outpatient clinic for youths in 1991.

10. Sexually Transmitted Diseases

In 1986, the reported number of sexually transmitted diseases (STD) had increased 22 percent over 1985.

The STD caseload in that year was being handled by a single individual who travelled to all of the area clinics. Hence, the Task Force recommended hiring an additional Public Health Service staff member for the Impact Area, and also opening additional clinics. Both New York State and Jefferson County were to monitor STD statistics in order to document the need for these actions.

11. Transient Management

In 1985, the Community Health Services Committee helped organize the Transient Management Workshop. It was found, however, that the transient problem never materialized to the extent anticipated.

12. Internal Issues

a. Lack of Baseline Data

Early in the planning process, the Community Health Services Committee began to survey all health-related service providers in the Impact Area to assess the numbers of people being served, eligibility requirements, etc. This survey was completed in 1986 and, as a result of its findings, the Committee recommended:

- o Recruitment of 17 primary care physicians;
- o Improved Medicaid reimbursements for primary services practitioners;
- o Reduction in medical liability costs;
- o Improved funding for public health/prevention programs, especially for children;
- o Improved agency coordination in issuing RFPs; and
- o Increased State attention to the need for better access to services for the medically indigent.

In 1988, the postline inventory was updated. The updated report indicated that Jefferson County would receive a \$170,000 grant from the State Department of Health for a primary health plan which emphasized prevention as well as maternal and child health/disease control.

In addition to the baseline health services inventory, which was a major accomplishment of the expansion planning process, other internal agency achievements have included a new Office of Community Services formed by Jefferson County; and a new State Rural Health Council, which includes a representative from the Health Care Task Force. The Task Force also urged the State to research the need for a County Health Department for Jefferson County. This, however, has not yet resulted in a new, full-fledged agency.

b. Lack of Networking

Perhaps the most important accomplishment of the expansion planning process was that it facilitated discussion among community health providers, planners, physicians, Army representatives, and politicians. This communication had been missing among the health care community prior to the expansion process. All those interviewed expressed the belief that this was, unquestionably, the greatest achievement of the effort.

In addition, it was felt that the expansion "put North Country on the map," and helped the community gain both State and Federal attention for program funding. As a result, the health community has felt encouraged to use this process as an opportunity to find creative solutions to problems.

D. FUTURE NEEDS

Future priorities, as identified by the Community Health Services Committee, include:

- o Recruitment and retention of health care personnel;

- o Expansion of adult inpatient alcohol and drug-related rehabilitation programs;
- o Evaluation of level of need for mental health prevention services, especially for children and youth; and
- o Expansion of school health services; expansion of primary medical care for students (including prevention, immunization, exercise, diet, and health education).

In addition, the community must work with the Army to resolve the future of the CHAMPUS program, and to determine what will happen when the Demonstration Project ends.

Chapter VIII

HUMAN SERVICES

A. INTRODUCTION

While the Fort Drum expansion brought with it the promise of economic gain for the North Country, the rapid influx of people also brought the potential for social problems which needed to be addressed. As in other areas of planning for the expansion, the human services community attempted to plan for these changes in a proactive way, before any one issue escalated to crisis status. However, human services groups frequently found such planning difficult to achieve due to funding shortages, staffing shortages, and a lack of coordinated information systems.

As a result of the Fort Drum planning process, however, various human services organizations have been able to develop into a much stronger cooperative network. They have been able to begin addressing many of the human services problems which emerged as a result of the expansion, as well as issues which were independent of the expansion effort.

B. ISSUES ANTICIPATED

1. Transient Population

It was feared that many people would come to the North County seeking jobs once the announcement of a major construction effort at Fort Drum was made public. Early in the expansion planning process, a Transient Management Workshop was held to discuss this issue. At this workshop, individuals from both the "boom town" experience in Garfield County, Colorado and the expansion

experience at Fort Stewart, Georgia spoke about transient influx. They recounted experiences of hundreds of people arriving in their communities, bringing problems of poverty, homelessness, mental and physical illness, child abuse, drugs, and so on. For the human service agencies, this issue became a major focal point during the initial planning period.

2. Displaced Persons

Until the 801 housing units were completed, the Army was authorized (in 1985-86) to lease units within the surrounding community. As a result of this decision, rents, which had been relatively low in this economically depressed area, began to increase rapidly. For low-income residents, this change was a major hardship. As a result, an area which traditionally did not have a homeless population problem began to see an increasing number of displaced persons. Affordable housing for low-income, long-time residents became a major concern of the human service agencies.

3. Cultural and Ethnic Diversity

Prior to the expansion, the North Country had been an area with a very small minority population, and with residents who had lived in the community for multiple generations. With the pending influx of new military personnel and their dependents, this picture was expected to change dramatically. Members of the human services organizations, along with other groups who were planning for the change, were aware of the need to educate and sensitize human service workers, as well as the community as a whole, to issues related to these demographic shifts.

4. Child Care

The lack of both adequate numbers of child care providers and affordable child care options, were longstanding problems in the community. Child care became a more critical concern for human services personnel as community cost of living increases compelled greater numbers of women to find work outside their homes.

5. Alcohol and Substance Abuse

The social service community anticipated a major increase in problems related to alcohol and drug abuse due to the influx of a young military population, a young construction population, and possible transient workers.

6. Child Abuse and Neglect/Spouse Abuse

Faced with the dual possibilities of a significant transient population and a large number of military families who would be young and far from their homes, the human services planners anticipated an increase in the incidence of cases of child abuse and neglect, as well as of spouse abuse. The community was largely unprepared to deal with these problems in significant numbers, and were aware that programs addressing these issues had to be established.

7. Information and Referral

At the outset of the expansion process, there was little networking between the social service agencies in the region. Faced with the pending arrival of a very large number of new

residents, these agencies needed a mechanism to inventory those services which were available and to distribute that information to newcomers. Experts from earlier "boom town" experiences had recommended this kind of information and referral service as an important mechanism for dealing with a quickly expanding population.

8. Youth Services

Problems of adolescent pregnancy, juvenile crime, school drop-out, and youth substance abuse were not new issues in the North Country. Jefferson County, for example, has the second highest teen pregnancy rate in New York State. The human services planners, however, were unsure about what the impact of the expansion would be on these problems (i.e., whether they would remain the same or become worse).

9. Crisis Intervention

It was expected that the social worker caseload would significantly increase due to an expanded population need for family counseling and other mental health services.

10. Transportation

Because of the general lack of public transportation within the Fort Drum Impact Area and outside the City of Watertown (which has taxi and municipal bus service), many low-income and/or elderly residents did not have adequate access to either health or human services. The decision to scatter 801 housing throughout the impact area raised the additional potential problem of service

accessibility for residents of the 801 developments, particularly for military dependents.

11. Internal Agency Issues

Many of the social service agencies in Jefferson County had been housed at the North Junior High School. With the anticipated increase in student population, the Watertown School District felt that it would be necessary to reclaim and reopen North Junior High. A new and reasonably priced facility for social services had to be found quickly, as did funding sources for renovations.

The lack of adequate resources, in terms of both funds and personnel, was a major issue for the human services community. Many of the new programs which would be needed in response to the expansion, required new and significant sources of funding. At the outset of the process, the human services agencies were unfamiliar with both the funding resources which might be available and the process for obtaining the funds.

C. ACTIONS TAKEN

The Human Services Task Force was one of the initial working groups established by the Fort Drum Steering Council. It was active from 1984 through 1989. The purpose of the Task Force was to define human service delivery problems within the Fort Drum Impact Area and to suggest ways to address those problems. The Task Force carried out its work through a number of subcommittees: Youth, Child Care, Housing, Information and Referral, Family Violence, Transient Management, and Crisis Intervention. In the course of this process, the group addressed many of the above issues which were anticipated to be potential problems.

1. Transient Population

The Task Force developed a Transient Management Plan. This involved a cooperative agreement among various agencies and included the location of potential emergency shelters and a plan for establishing job programs, health treatment, and an after-hours information line to direct individuals to food and shelter.

In actuality, the anticipated influx of a large transient population never materialized. The Plan initially intended for transient assistance was later applied in helping displaced persons. As late as February, 1990, human service staff was still reporting the arrival of some transient individuals in the community. It is expected that the area will continue to see some transients during the next several years as work becomes hard to find in other areas and as unemployed individuals learn about Fort Drum. The massive transient influx that was feared in 1984 will probably not occur.

2. Displaced Persons

In 1986, the Task Force distributed a survey to all human service and housing providers to determine the extent of the displaced person problem. The Task Force continued to monitor this issue.

As a result of its survey, the Task Force found that the issue of displaced persons in the Impact Area was far more severe than the problem of transients. Hardest hit were those members of the population who were young and single. The Task Force established the Housing Subcommittee to monitor and address this issue.

In 1986, no shelters were available to house displaced individuals, with the exceptions of a shelter for battered women. Motel rooms were being used as a housing alternative. During the next several years, the Community Action Planning Council (CAPC) opened two shelters for transitional housing purposes: one for families and, in 1989, one for single persons. As of the end of 1989, the County was housing 137 persons in either shelters or motels. Housing for young, single individuals remains the most critical problem.

In 1987, the Jefferson County Department of Social Services (DSS) received an increase in its housing assistance allowance from New York State. At the same time, however, the State reduced DSS's food stamp assistance program. This latter action was related to an increase in the overall income level within the County.

In 1988, DSS established an emergency telephone line to address the need for housing during evenings and weekends.

The social services agencies are continuing to monitor the extent of the displaced persons problem within the area. With Army housing completed, rents in the Impact Area should stabilize. It is very unlikely, however, that these will be as low as they were prior to the expansion. The plan, from the beginning, was to construct housing for low- and moderate-income families. Many initiatives have finally resulted in major housing construction to be available in 1990 and 1991.

3. Cultural/Ethnic Diversity

In 1986 and 1987, human service providers participated in a series of Cultural Diversity Workshops provided by Fort Drum Equal

Opportunity specialists. These sessions were intended to sensitize educators and social service professionals to the potential issues concerning the reality of a multiracial, ethnically diverse population and to ensure that the population shift would occur without major conflict.

To date, the transition to a more culturally and racially complex population has been very smooth and without any significant problems.

4. Child Care

The child care issue focused on the lack of accessible and affordable day care and after school care for infants, young children, and sick children. In 1986, to document the extent of this problem, the Jefferson-Lewis Child Coordinating Council, which was formed as a result of the expansion planning process, surveyed 200 families. The results indicated that 61 percent of the families surveyed needed child care, but that 30 percent did not have access to child care services due to lack of availability, prohibitive costs, or transportation problems. The study also found that 27 percent of those surveyed were on some form of public assistance and that 24 percent earned less than \$10,000 per year. Cost of child care was, therefore, a critical factor for many families. The study recommended applying for State funds, and establishing a child care network to develop a provider training program.

In 1987, the Community Action Planning Council (CAPC) of Jefferson County was designated to provide a Child Care Resource and Referral Program. CAPC received a grant for \$76,000 from the State for this program. This program has provided training for care givers and has resulted in a significant increase in the

number of qualified day care providers in the area.

In addition, the Army has established two child care facilities at Fort Drum for military dependents.

5. Substance Abuse

The community has experienced a significant increase in the number of reported cases of substance abuse. Human service providers, however, report that it is difficult to establish the extent to which this increase can be attributed to the Fort Drum expansion. It is felt that the increase can also be tied to a greater awareness on the part of State and local governments regarding this problem and to a major effort to more rigorously enforce drunk driving and drug laws.

The Community Services Board in Jefferson County has played a major and significant role in coordinating alcohol and substance abuse services in the County. These services include preventative education, as well as outpatient and inpatient treatment. The Board continues to coordinate the expansion of these services.

In addition, the Army has established its own drug and alcohol abuse programs. The extent to which military personnel use these programs or turn to the mental health programs within the community is not known.

6. Child Abuse and Neglect/Spouse Abuse

Significant increases have occurred in reported cases of child abuse and neglect. For example, in 1986, the Child Protective Services Division of DSS investigated 608 child abuse/maltreatment

referrals. By 1987, this number had increased to 813, and continued to increase in 1988 (998 cases) and in 1989 (1,165 cases). Within the first five months of 1990, 563 case referrals had been reported. Moreover, the County courts have also reported an increase in the number of such cases as part of their workloads.

This issue has received a great deal of community attention. As with the substance abuse problem, however, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the increase in child abuse and neglect can be attributed to the expansion of Fort Drum. During the past several years, Federal and State programs, as well as the media, have publicized these issues extensively and have greatly increased public awareness and public reporting of these problems.

Recognizing the increased need to address these issues, several human service agencies created new programs. Funded by the State, a new Child Sexual Abuse Program was begun. This program also receives contributions through the United Way. The Program offers counselling for children, youths, and families.

In addition, the State also increased funding to the Women, Infant, Child (WIC) Program to provide counselling for child abuse and neglect cases.

Finally, three parent provider groups (i.e., Catholic Charities, Cooperative Extension Service, and an unaffiliated social worker) began to offer educational programs for "at risk" parents.

Fort Drum, through its Family Advocacy Program, offers education, crisis intervention, and counselling to military cases of child and spouse abuse. It appears, however, that many military personnel would prefer to bring abuse problems to a community provider rather than to an Army program, due to fear of career

repercussions under the Army program. Under New York State law, DSS cannot release the names of child or spouse abusers under its care to the Army. This has been an issue of concern to the Army since, without knowledge of an individual's treatment, the Army cannot ensure the continuity of that treatment should the soldier be transferred. Moreover, the Army's CHAMPUS insurance will not cover the treatment unless the soldier has been referred by an Army physician. To date, the Army and DSS have been unable to resolve this issue, which has now gone to the State level for resolution.

7. Information and Referral

In 1985, CAPC received a \$25,000 grant from New York State to implement an Information and Referral Program in Jefferson County. In 1986, the Human Services Task Force, in coordination with the Army, set up a tri-county Information and Referral Program. The Army program, "Help Line" remains active.

In 1987, the Jefferson County Council of Social Agencies withdrew its support for the CAPC Information and Referral program since it felt that CAPC had not been able to adequately implement the program in two years. The Council recommended that the program be operated by a "neutral agency." Eventually, the United Way assumed responsibility for this service as a "First Call For Help" line, in conjunction with Mercy Hospital's Community Health Center. This service is still active and the Army refers evening and weekend calls to this United Way line.

8. Youth Services

The number of youths using community recreation services has increased significantly during the Fort Drum expansion. In 1988,

the Jefferson County Youth Bureau formed a Recreation Task Force to undertake a three-year recreation study. This study, which is independent of the efforts of the FDSC, will include a facility inventory, a directory of services, and a survey of need. The study is presently under way.

Fort Drum offers a substantial youth program for families living on-post. The program needs to be expanded to off-post families.

The impact of the Fort Drum expansion on the teen pregnancy rate is unclear. The rate appears to be slowly declining. In 1989, the Impact Area received an Adolescent Pregnancy Grant of \$250,000 from the Governor's Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Service Program.

In addressing the school drop-out issue, the Carthage Central School District has begun a small-scale child care facility (i.e., one which can accommodate eight babies) to assist adolescent mothers who wish to return to school.

The New York State Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) is providing occupational education for high school students in construction technology and related trades.

9. Crisis Intervention

The human service agencies have found, with the Fort Drum expansion, an increase in the family crisis intervention caseload. This includes cases of spouse abandonment, custody issues, and so on.

Spouse abandonment within the 801 housing setting was an unanticipated problem. If a soldier leaves his/her spouse and they live in an 801 housing unit, the spouse must vacate that unit within a specified period of time. Frequently, social service providers have found that the spouse may not understand this requirement and is suddenly left without a home, far from family support, and lacking funds. Human services agencies on-post and in the community are often called for help.

These problems have increased the workloads of the social service agencies and the family courts. Significant staff increases have occurred to alleviate this problem, but additional staff is needed.

Finding who to call for help and establishing inter-agency professional staff linkages were important, but difficult, issues which required resolution. Some strained relations occurred between military care givers, especially on follow-up regarding family court matters. One solution was an Army-sponsored open house facilitated by the FDSC, where providers could get to know each other. In addition, the Army handles military family crisis intervention problems through its Family Advocacy Program.

10. Transportation

The lack of public transportation within the Impact Area remains an unresolved issue. The issue is discussed further in the Transportation section of this report.

11. Internal Agency Issues

a. New social services facility

With the need to relocate social service agencies from the North Junior High School, many providers viewed this as a chance to consolidate widely dispersed agencies within a single facility. In addition, it offered agencies who could not afford the escalating rents in the area the possibility of sharing a facility with other providers at an affordable cost to all.

In 1986, the social service agencies began to consider the possibility of relocating to the long-closed and badly deteriorated Cooper Street School. The Watertown School District was interested in selling the building, and the agencies hoped to obtain \$1.5 million for renovations. In 1986, applications were submitted to the New York State Urban Initiatives Grant Program and to the United States Department of Health and Human Services. An application for a Community Development Block Grant was also submitted. The Federal grants were denied. However, New York State did provide a grant for \$100,000 for this project. In addition, the SCORE provided assistance in negotiating loans with several area banks.

A \$10,000 grant was received from the Adirondack North Country Association to renovate the Cooper Street School as a Human Services Agency Community Center. Moreover, an additional \$20,000 grant was provided by the Northern New York Community Foundation.

Finally, in 1989, CAPC completed negotiations on a \$1 million package to renovate the school. At this writing, construction is under way. It is estimated that an additional \$56,000 will be needed to complete the project.

b. Network/Inventory

In 1985, early in the expansion planning process, the Human Services Task Force carried out a preliminary needs assessment survey of agencies within the Impact Area. The results of that survey indicated many service redundancies and gaps. The survey also highlighted the need for a more thorough assessment study to establish a baseline level of information regarding services from which longer-term planning strategies (i.e., 5 year projections) could be determined. Following the recommendation of the Task Force, FDSC hired a full-time Health and Human Services Planner for a one-year term, to gather the data for this baseline study.

In 1986, the importance of completing a thorough Needs Assessment Study was again discussed by the Task Force, as were the resources available to support this effort. The Task Force discussed alternative approaches for (1) identifying service gaps; (2) prioritizing needs; (3) networking to close gaps; and (4) identifying sources of funding.

In 1989, the United Way made the commitment to implement a community-wide Needs Assessment and Priority Setting Model. At this writing, the organization has hired staff to complete the Assessment and the FDSC has provided funds to support the effort. This will be an annual assessment which will provide data and prioritizing recommendations to County care provider agencies.

Overall, however, the human services planning process that was necessitated by the expansion effort has resulted in a tremendous increase in the level of networking among human services providers. The Task Force process contributed significantly to this outcome by bringing providers together to communicate and plan in a

cooperative spirit. Many of the human services representatives interviewed felt that this was the most important outcome of the expansion planning process.

c. Obtaining Resources

Human services providers found it difficult to obtain start-up funding for proactive planning purposes. Many funding agencies required "hard numbers" as evidence of need, and would not accept statistics on projected needs. Eventually, the Task Force obtained some help from FDSC in developing data which could be used to approach both Federal and State agencies for funding. In addition, the FDSC's endorsement of this effort helped in obtaining funds from New York State.

Agencies found it difficult to hire qualified staff in the numbers needed to address an increasing workload. This remains an ongoing problem. Local social agency salaries are not competitive with salaries offered for State and Federal positions. In response to the need for qualified social workers, Jefferson Community College added as Associate of Science Degree in Human Sciences to its curriculum. This received New York State approval in 1987.

d. Recognition of Need

Several human service providers expressed the view that many of those involved in the overall process of planning for the Fort Drum expansion did not recognize the urgency and importance of human service issues, and did not understand how the success of the expansion effort was linked to the need to address these issues.

In 1988, a survey of Task Force members carried out by the FDSC indicated that Human Service Task Force responses included the

view that it had not received adequate guidance from the FDSC, and that the Council did not understand what the Task Force had been trying to accomplish.

D. FUTURE NEEDS

The human service providers interviewed identified the following as those needs requiring most immediate attention:

- o Completion of the Needs Assessment Study.
- o A continuing mechanism for networking in the tri-county area. The Task Force has suggested that this be accomplished through the Council of Social Agencies, the United Way, and the advisory/planning bodies of various agencies. This joint agency approach has now been implemented.
- o Expansion of recreational opportunities for youth; completion of the recreation needs inventory and plan.
- o Attention to the issue of transportation for youth, poor, elderly, and rural populations.
- o Possible addition of a human services circuit rider to serve rural communities (i.e., an expansion of the circuit rider system begun by the Tug Hill Commission for providing technical planning expertise; this is discussed further in the Land Use section).
- o Need for additional foster homes for hard-to-place and at-risk youth.
- o Need to hire an additional judge for Family Court.

Chapter IX

PUBLIC SAFETY

A. INTRODUCTION

Rapid growth and change usually creates public safety problems for a community. When the change involves the introduction of a new player, such as the military, with its own jurisdictional "turf" and policies, these problems are compounded. The impacts of growth can be as much psychological as actual, especially with public safety where expectations and fears shape the public's perceptions. There were many such fears associated with the Fort Drum expansion, including expected increases in violent crimes, drug trafficking, and rape.

In reality, the impacts of growth within the Fort Drum region have been controlled relatively well due, in large part, to effective coordination between various law enforcement agencies. Although the total number of certain offenses such as DWI, theft, and arson have increased, the increases do not seem markedly out of line with the population growth. Similarly, increases in domestic crimes such as child abuse cannot be directly linked to the Fort Drum expansion and may simply reflect national trends.

That is not to say there have been no problems related to the massive expansion. Issues related to funding and manpower shortages have plagued police departments, probation departments, fire departments and the court systems. However, a number of programs and actions, including the formation of a Law Enforcement Subcommittee, a joint sheriff/city police training facility, a mobile radio district, construction of a joint City/County law enforcement facility, and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) have helped mitigate growth impacts. Issues that still need to be

addressed include manpower shortages, a lack of ethnic diversity in the State and military police departments, a large court backlog, and the on-going tri-county effort to develop a "911" emergency dispatching system.

B. ISSUES ANTICIPATED

1. Military/Community Relations

Underlying all of the public safety issues was the problem of how to effectively coordinate military and civilian operations. With the decision to place a significant amount of Army housing throughout the Impact Area, jurisdictional lines between military and civilian police forces were blurred, creating confusion and the potential for conflict. Effective communication between the military and local police departments would be essential if conflicts were to be avoided. The community would have to be educated as to its roles and responsibilities in the system. This issue was particularly critical not only because it involved the creation of a strategy for attacking other problems as well, but also because it symbolized the interdependence of the military and the local community and presented an opportunity to encourage an atmosphere of cooperation.

2. Increase in Crime

It was anticipated that not only would the number of crimes increase, but that the types of crimes committed would shift. Local officials cited the example of Ft. Stewart, Georgia, where an upsurge in theft, criminal mischief and simple assault cases followed expansion of that Post. The community expected that crimes of violence would increase dramatically. A rise in DWI

rates was also expected, and has proven to be the most significant rate increase over the course of the Fort Drum expansion. DWI's make up 25 percent of the Probation Departments' caseloads; 420 DWI cases are currently pending in the Jefferson County Court system. It was expected that not all of the offenders would be soldiers and that the influx of construction workers would also contribute to the upsurge in crime rates. The increase in crime was expected to result in manpower and equipment shortages. Related overflow in the court system was expected to follow.

3. Emergency Medical System

Coordination between the military and civilian communities was also a key issue in the development of an emergency medical system. It would be difficult to create an integrated emergency system linking the disparate rural communities scattered throughout the Northern Country. Adding to this geographical problem, emergency equipment in many of the communities was minimal and often outdated. Moreover, the local communities lacked both skilled emergency technicians and the necessary training programs and funds to alleviate this problem.

4. Probation Issues

The County Probation Departments also braced themselves for various growth impacts. They anticipated that case loads would be strained and that new probation officers would be required. Statistics show that probation case loads have expanded. In Jefferson County, probation intake cases have increased from 1,662 in 1984 to 2,367 in 1989. Investigations increased from 468 in 1984 to 1206 in 1989, and supervision cases rose from 373 to 630. However, the number of juvenile delinquency cases actually declined

from 347 to 260 over this period. Lewis County has also experienced an increase in its probation caseload.

C. ACTIONS TAKEN

1. Police Departments: Civilian/Military Coordination

The problem of coordination between police departments was effectively alleviated by a civilian and military "memo of understanding." The 801 housing areas are served by local police except in situations that are clearly of a military nature. The military provides support services to local police and M.P.'s make regular calls to local police departments to maintain lines of communication. Turnover in 801 housing necessitates continuing educational programs to help 801 residents understand the responsibilities of the various police organizations within the 801 context.

Military/civilian coordination has been helpful in coping with the rising number of crime cases. In response to a 40 percent increase in "bad checks" in Watertown, a Law Enforcement Subcommittee met with the Fort Drum Provost Office and set up a check-writing training program for local retailers. In addition, American Express experts were brought in to train local authorities on credit card fraud.

Manpower and equipment shortages, aggravated by funding delays, have taxed local and State police departments during the Fort Drum expansion. The Watertown Police Department adapted to this situation by making their internal procedures more efficient. They streamlined their reporting system, realigned their patrol staffing, and created a warrant services unit. Eleven new sworn and five non-sworn patrolmen were hired, and previously untapped

funding was obtained to finance changes. Four communities have hired new officers to handle the 16 percent increase in dispatching that occurred in a single year. Manpower deficiencies are also related to problems in recruitment and training. Some members of the community have expressed the belief that many of the most qualified personnel are enticed away from local police department jobs by either Fort Drum or the State prison. It is difficult to train part-time officers because of scheduling conflicts. In response to this problem, the Watertown Police Department created a joint sheriff and police training facility that has worked closely with the military. They also started a joint Narcotics Unit. In addition, the State Police have increased manpower to combat shortages caused by rising crime rates.

2. Probation Departments

Increased caseloads and recruitment problems have created a shortage of qualified officers and counselors in probation departments. Civil Service lists are felt to be an unsatisfactory solution since they often do not provide the most qualified candidate options. Funding delays have compounded the problem. It has been impossible for County Probation Departments to plan for growth because the State government will not authorize additional personnel until caseloads are already overloaded. The new responsibilities of the conditional release program have added somewhat to the case burden, although very few offenders have been released to date under this program. Jefferson County has responded to this situation by increasing the number of probation officers from 10 in 1984 to 21 in 1989. A probation officer intake office was set up at Fort Drum in February of 1990. By necessity, an effective communications network has developed between the military and the three County probation departments.

3. The Court System

As expected, the court system suffers from a sizeable backlog due to an increase in cases, and a shortage of judges and support staff. In Carthage, there were \$12,000 in fines in 1983 and \$90,000 in 1989. Significant strain is felt in the area of family court cases, where an additional judge is needed. The types of crimes being prosecuted have become more serious. All cases have long delays due to the substantial backlog. Cases involving military personnel often face scheduling conflicts when soldiers fail to appear in court. The Civil Liaison Section at Fort Drum has implemented procedures to ensure that a soldier due for trial will appear at the appointed time. Coordination has been enhanced by an excellent working relationship between the District Attorney's Office and the military. Due to the increase in staff and workload, the present facilities within Jefferson County had become inadequate. A new court space in the proposed Jefferson County Safety Complex is scheduled to be completed in 1992; the complex will include a family court, a new County court, an office for the DA, and a Grand Jury facility.

4. Emergency Medical Services/Fire Department

The demand for emergency medical services has increased as expected. There have been shortages of adequate equipment and a lack of trained volunteers and other personnel. North Country Emergency Medical Services (EMS) was particularly active in training volunteers and other emergency personnel. The FDSC secured a \$60,000 grant from the State of New York in 1988 for EMS training and equipment. This grant was an important catalyst for EMS; it supplied the necessary foundation for its information network, allowing the group to expand its office staff, purchase

computer equipment, create a Crisis Team, fund seminars, acquire training equipment, and purchase equipment and supplies. Other programs spearheaded by EMS include a volunteer recruitment service, in an effort to reverse a slow decline in membership, First Responder, and the Army and National Registry EMT programs.

EMS has increased the number of classes it sponsors from 13 to 30 per year. Various specialty courses are offered. As the costs of equipment, supplies, and training have increased, squads are having to spend more time raising funds, which cuts into time for training and running calls.

The fire departments have worked closely with EMS on several programs including the First Responder system. Under this system, the closest fire department and the closest ambulance are sent to an emergency. Fire department participation has become increasingly critical as participation in the Volunteer Service declines. Ties between EMS and the fire departments were strengthened by the appointment of the Fire Coordinator as EMS Coordinator.

Fire departments have sought alternative financial strategies. Funding has been secured from the City of Watertown (\$15,000); Jefferson County (\$50,000); and New York State (\$40,000). DANC provided a two-year equipment grant with matching funding from St. Lawrence and Jefferson Counties. Expansion has also created problems related to recruitment. A creative recruitment tool in the form of a videotape was developed under the auspices of the Jefferson County Fire Chief's Association.

In an effort to create an EMS strategy that would be effective despite the spread-out nature and severe climate of the Impact Area, the M.A.S.T. program was instigated. It would prove to be one of the most controversial issues in the public safety arena due

to safety concerns over the landing pad and difficulties in coordinating the efforts of City government, Mercy Hospital and the military.

In September and October of 1986, St. Lawrence County, Jefferson County and Lewis County endorsed the concept of M.A.S.T. as stated in Army Regulation #500-4. According to this provision, M.A.S.T. can be used to supplement existing emergency medical systems by providing military helicopters outfitted as air ambulances for emergency transport of civilians. This program presented an exciting opportunity for cooperation between Ft. Drum and civilian groups in the creation of a significant amenity for the region.

A tri-county request in 1987 for a \$8,012 grant from the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles to fund the M.A.S.T. project was rejected. As a result, the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors appropriated \$3,210 to M.A.S.T.; St. Lawrence County contributed \$3,205 and Lewis County, \$1,602.

When the M.A.S.T. program was finally established in late 1987, the plan was to use the helipad atop Mercy Hospital for landings. The City of Watertown, however, felt that this helipad did not conform to acceptable standards. The National Fire Protection Association Code #418 requires four independent fire protection systems at a hospital helipad. The Mercy Hospital facility required a new standpipe and a foam fire extinguishing system. However, Mercy Hospital was not prepared to shoulder all of the financial burden for these safety systems and requested a variance to Code #418. In December 1987, an Army helicopter landed on the helipad before the Code issues had been resolved. The Watertown Fire Chief threatened to seek penalties against the Army helicopter pilot, and Major General Carpenter considered suspending M.A.S.T. After another unauthorized landing, the General did

suspend the program. Realizing they needed to act quickly or risk losing a valuable asset to the community, the City of Watertown dropped its charges against the first pilot and worked out a temporary agreement with Mercy Hospital. The hospital would purchase the required foam fire protection device, list the City on its liability insurance policy, and promise to hold the City harmless in the event of a crash lawsuit.

In May 1988, the issue went before the Syracuse/ Watertown Uniform Code Board of Review. The Board voted to uphold the City of Watertown's ruling that the Code must be enforced, but allowed Mercy Hospital to install a manually-operated, fixed foam system instead of an automatic system. Eighty thousand dollars was raised from the counties to help pay for the system.

The project's high profile was a positive factor in rallying support for the fundraising effort. Contributions to the hospital were received from people whose lives had been saved by the M.A.S.T. program. Despite the highly publicized series of events, the system was activated on an unusually fast track, compared to those at other military installations. Creative planning, aggressive fundraising, and cooperative efforts contributed to the success of this program.

D. FUTURE NEEDS

Public safety agencies continue to experience manpower and staffing shortages. Competitive salaries and creative recruitment techniques, such as the fire department videotape (which is being used to encourage individuals to think of becoming firefighters), should be used to attack this problem. Ethnic diversity should be encouraged in recruitment for both civilian and military police forces. Some of the villages need to consider recruiting trained

and certified police officers in order to develop full-time departments.

The court system of the Impact Area is burdened by a monumental backlog. An additional full-time judge is required to handle family court cases. There is insufficient legal aid, especially in Jefferson County.

Emergency medical services are still inadequate in the tri-county region due to funding shortages and a lack of qualified volunteers. In particular, the area would greatly benefit from a "911" emergency system and a concerted tri-county effort is being made to foster the kind of cooperative atmosphere needed to coordinate the technical aspects of the system.

In 1989, State legislation was passed to create a pool of revenue at the county level to fund by a "911" feasibility study and start-up costs. The FDSC has pledged \$60,000 to get the "911" initiative under way.

Chapter X

TRANSPORTATION

A. INTRODUCTION

Transportation issues, particularly those related to traffic, are consistently mentioned as major concerns associated with the expansion of Fort Drum. In general, the existing network had the capacity to handle the expansion. Although growth did significantly impact the regional transportation network, this growth has been accommodated by transportation system improvements.

New York State, through its Department of Transportation, worked closely with the Army to identify needs, implement improvements and accomplish these within an unprecedented fast-track schedule.

B. ISSUES ANTICIPATED

With the announcement in 1984 of the Fort Drum expansion, the communities within the impact area expressed concerns related to anticipated traffic increases within localities, and particularly along the main access routes to the Post. The Army expressed access concerns as well, and raised the issue regarding the adequacy of the existing transportation network to accommodate the increase in manpower and heavy equipment. Finally, the means of paying for required transportation improvements was a primary concern of local governments.

C. ACTIONS TAKEN

1. New York State Response

The strong political support that was generated for the selection of Fort Drum as the location of the 10th Mountain Division resulted in an equally strong response to transportation needs. In June of 1984, prior to the Army's final decision regarding a home for the Division, Governor Cuomo pledged to provide all necessary access improvements should the Fort Drum site be selected. New York State has subsequently implemented that pledge. To date, the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) has invested \$38.2 million in improvements within the Impact Region. This figure is anticipated growing to \$60 million, with matching funds from the Federal government, before all planned improvements have been completed. The NYSDOT's program of improvements has included forty-two projects, ranging from surface improvements and additional capacity projects to reconstructed intersections and new bridge construction. Fort Drum area represents the only location in the State in which the NYSDOT was authorized to build projects based on anticipated, rather than actual, capacity problems. The Department feels that its planning effort has been "on target", and that it has neither over- or under built in the Impact Area.

In March 1985, early in the transportation planning process, New York State appropriated \$500,000 for the Fort Drum Area Transportation Study. This study assessed the transportation needs of the Impact Area, documented those needs, and made recommendations for meeting them. Many of the seventy-four issues and concerns identified by this study were local, and included capacity problems, safety issues, road/bridge deterioration, etc. The study predicted that the overall level of vehicle travel miles

in the Impact Area would increase by 60 percent by the year 2010. In addition, this study established baseline data for the entire Impact Area with regard to road networks.

2. Army/Community Response

The Army's decision to scatter the 801 housing sites alleviated the potential problem of traffic congestion along a single main access route to the Post. The scattered site option has allowed for the use of multiple routes for access purposes.

A major point of contention between the Army and the local communities arose in 1986 over the issue of Jefferson County Route 29. A portion of this County road runs directly through Fort Drum; the Army planned to close that section for construction of airfield facilities. The local communities who relied on the road for access (e.g., the Town of Philadelphia), protested the closure, and requested that the road be relocated by the Army.

Fort Drum commissioned a study by Roger Creighton which concluded that the closing of the road would cause minimal inconvenience. Both Jefferson County and the local towns disagreed with this conclusion, however. The issue became quite emotional. In seeking a way for the Army to accommodate the community's concerns, several meetings were held between Fort Drum leaders and Jefferson County. The issue became one of funding for the road relocation. Neither Federal nor State funds were available.

Finally, Fort Drum and Jefferson County agreed to exchange land, with Jefferson County agreeing to fund the road reconstruction. The decision to drop the airfield expansion from the total Fort Drum construction project allowed Jefferson County a longer time to respond to this change. Major road work has now

been completed and the new Route 29 will be paved by the Spring of 1990.

3. Local Jurisdictional Response

Local jurisdictions have been more limited in their capacity to plan for required transportation improvements. Defense Access Funds, which are often available to localities for improving roads which provide military access, were not made available to the Fort Drum Impact Area communities on the basis that New York State had assured the Federal government that it would finance whatever access improvements were needed. Other Federal funds were also not available.

For the most part, existing County roads have proven adequate to accommodate the growth to date resulting from the Fort Drum expansion. The primary exception is the City of Watertown which gave priority to water and sewer improvements, and must now address road improvements in order to alleviate its increasing traffic problems.

In response to local needs, the Fort Drum Steering Council funded the "Fort Drum Local Highway Impact Study", which was completed at the end of 1989. The purpose of this effort was to determine traffic impacts on local roads as a result of the expansion, and to develop recommended road improvements. The study found the need for forty-six local road improvements ranging from signalization improvements to street widenings, restripings, and curb changes. To date, all but fourteen of these have been accomplished or are currently under construction.

4. Unresolved Issues

Finally, one additional transportation issue has been discussed and studied within the Impact Area; however no action has yet been taken on it. This issue concerns public transit. The lack of public transportation within the region became a Fort Drum related issue with the decision to locate 801 housing sites on scattered sites. It was believed that many of the 801 residents (particularly military dependents) would not have access to cars and would require some form of public transportation. The Army has established a bus system between distant 801 sites and the Post. Ridership on these buses has, however, been much lower than anticipated.

In January, 1987, the Central New York Regional Transportation Authority (CENTRO) completed a "Transit Development Program" for Jefferson County. This study recommended that a program be initiated to expand the existing Watertown bus system, to provide commuter service to the 801 sites, and to provide service to rural areas.

Jefferson County reviewed this proposal and did not recommend its implementation. Acceptance of the program would have required County membership in the Authority. Such membership would have involved substantial financial obligations and, it was felt, would have resulted in necessary increases in both mortgage tax revenues and County appropriations. The County did not feel that the CENTRO proposal warranted these increased financial commitments.

As an alternative, the County has pursued the possible provision of public transit through the private sector. Faced with the large geographic size of the area, however, and the dispersed population within that area, private sector providers have felt

that a totally private transit system would not be an economically feasible venture.

D. FUTURE NEEDS

The counties and, in particular, the City of Watertown are presently in the position of "catching up" on those road networks that are off the State highway system and are not eligible for State or Federal funding. These improvements must compete for local funding with other needed improvement issues.

In addition, localities require funding for training existing staff and for hiring new staff who have the analytical and technical skills needed for long-term transportation planning. The earlier Transportation Study provided baseline data which could be used to establish a transportation model for the counties. Jefferson County also has an on-line model of the road system within the Impact Area. While some of the present planning staff have the technical expertise to use these tools, both the County and other local planning agencies need staff with the capability to maximize implementation of this potentially useful planning tool.

Continued and long-term liaison with the State DOT is essential. When the 1990 census figures are received, the area may be eligible to establish a Metropolitan Planning Organization which could provide State funding of local area staffing and planning activities.

Jefferson County has stated that it will continue to explore the issue of a public transit system. There is concern that, because of the distances involved and the thinly dispersed nature of the population, a transit system may not be cost effective.

CHAPTER XI

MODELLING AND OTHER TASK FORCES

A. Modelling

The Modelling Task Force had a role in the original planning and forecasting for the Fort Drum build-up. The information that was developed under the auspices of this task force affected all aspects of planning for and mitigating the impacts of the population growth. Activities undertaken by the task force involved a forecasting for fiscal impacts, population growth, school enrollment, and housing needs.

One of the early tasks that was handled by the Task Force was oversight of a fiscal impact assessment. The study was done originally by the Office of Economic Adjustment, Department of Defense and considered a wide variety of factors. The preliminary study was completed in 1986 and was subsequently updated by the FDSC staff in 1987. It was a multi-step process which provided planning input for the community, with a focus on fiscal elements of the process.

The impact analysis utilized a model used by the Army in which the federal civilian employment, military employment and local population growth were key inputs; other factors included the local labor market, regional population distribution, and indirect impacts. Key aspects of this analysis included an assessment of on-post construction, and considered the types of facilities that would be built, as well as the infrastructure construction requirements. Military population forecasts used Army-wide multipliers showing married households and households with dependents. Within the federal civilian labor market, similarly, Army expectations were factored into the forecast, showing civilian employment by grade and salary range. In analyzing the local labor

market, this impact model looked at the supply and demand for various skills and drew conclusions on the potential imbalances. Taken into consideration was the fact that approximately 2,000 workers were expected to be needed for direct base construction requirements.

Indirect impacts identified by this model included local spin-off construction that was catalyzed by the post, non-appropriated funds services, and off-post personnel needs. The final result of this work was a population distribution model, showing the expected growth broken out by specific towns and villages. It indicated where public water, sewer, school capacity, zoning, utility, etc., changes were going to be needed to accommodate the growth.

The study forecast impacts on housing costs, taxes and fees, available land and other development aspects. Finally, it took into account travel times, need for services, quality of life, and utility costs. The bottom line conclusion of the study was a forecast of the public sector revenues that would be generated by the post build-up, the expenditures required from municipalities to meet build-up demands, and the future capital requirements.

There were a large number of contributors to this original study. They included the task force, the Office of Economic Adjustment, Logistics Management Institute, the Regional Economic Group from Clarkson University, Fort Drum military and civilian staff, several school districts, the Drum Area Council of Governments, municipal planning offices, the Fort Drum Land Use Team, the Tug Hill Commission, the New York State Division of the Budget, the Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES). In the original forecast, the population growth forecast was 28,712. The first impact study by OEA was done using a "top down" approach in which the entire area was first evaluated and then the impacts were translated into smaller jurisdiction impacts.

When the fiscal impact model was updated by FDSC, the conclusion was there would be 924 more people than originally expected and the civilian component of total growth would be 21 percent as opposed to the original 17 percent. This conclusion was based on the fact that more construction jobs were predicted and a higher percent of married soldiers was anticipated. The second study was a bottom-up study when the fiscal impacts were determined. That is, spreadsheet financial analyses were prepared for each of the impacted jurisdictions and added together. This provided an aggregate, fiscal impact assessment.

This modelling task was input into the overall planning effort, and was critical for several reasons:

1. It determined the likely number of civilian, immigrant jobs, the jobs that would be filled by regional employees, and the total military employment. From this forecast, a conclusion was drawn concerning the permanency of the construction jobs; that is whether or not they would ultimately stay in the region. Based on total employment expectations, as well as a characterization of the military immigrants, the modelling task force was able to determine the housing needs within the impact area. This was calculated by identifying how many households would reside on post, in 801, in existing housing, and in newly constructed civilian housing. Because the influx of military and labor were scheduled on a yearly basis, this gave the community an indication of the incremental need for housing.
2. The information concerning military households and their dependents, as well as civilian immigrants and their dependents, was distributed into school districts. The

forecast -- over a period of several years -- showed the age breakdown of the school children, an indication of the grade level they would be expected to enter. In retrospect, these forecasts were generally accurate, and assisted the school districts in gearing up for the growth, hiring staff, and preparing their curriculum for the influx of school children. Copenhagen and Watertown School Districts were the exceptions to this; the impacts did not materialize as expected.

3. The geographic distribution of population growth was shown by municipality throughout the impact area. Because water and sewer capabilities were expected to be a constraining factor, the population growth forecasts were compared with capabilities of the cities and towns to deal with them. Where there were instances of expected population growth that could not be accommodated by the existing infrastructure, the modelling task force was able to identify the expected needs for infrastructure and services effected by population growth.
4. In evaluating the changes in the labor force, the Modelling Task Force took into consideration the characteristics of the existing labor supply -- their skills, their wage levels, and unemployment rates -- and weighted these with the expected characteristics of the immigrating labor force. The character of the labor force moving to the Fort Drum area was defined by skills required and forecast union wage rates. A mesh of these two types of information gave a reasonably accurate assessment of the financial capacity of those moving to the area, which reflected in turn on their capability to pay for housing and ultimately, the need for subsidized units.

5. The Task Force looked also at some of the "softer" aspects of planning for growth. Some of their analyses included the capability of municipal governments to handle proposed development, as well as their attitudes toward growth. Each of these aided in the assessment of jurisdictions and identification of which could accommodate growth. This qualitative analysis provided information to the Steering Council for use in their growth management plan. Ultimately, these analyses were translated into an identification of several communities which could accommodate the proposed off-post housing.

By 1986, the detailed and computerized analyses were largely complete. Because the Task Force assessment had been done on spreadsheets, it was possible to make ongoing refinements in the forecast as the month-to-month Army immigrant schedule changed. Final conclusions that were reached by the Modelling Task Force showed that six of the school districts (Watertown, Indian River, Carthage, General Brown, Thousand Islands, and Copenhagen) would be impacted with 85 percent of the school growth. With respect to population increase, 93 percent (or 27,550 people) were expected to locate in Jefferson County, the remaining 4.3 percent in Lewis County and another 2.7 percent in St. Lawrence County.

The fiscal impact conclusions also showed that during the growth period, the Jefferson County capital expenditure requirements would exceed the estimated project-related revenues - - through at least 1989. The early years of the growth were occurring during a tight-budget time frame. Similarly, Lewis County was expected to encounter project-related experiences that would exceed their potential revenues, also through 1989. St. Lawrence County was expected to have a small impact at the county level. Similarly, the City of Watertown, the impacted towns and

villages, and the school districts, would likely experience operating deficits, and initial capital and operating costs were expected to surpass potential revenues.

These financial and fiscal analyses were part of the argument that the Fort Drum Steering Council was able to present to state and federal agencies in an effort to generate assistance and grant money.

The consultant team briefly evaluated the forecasting approaches that were conducted in the North Country to enable the community to deal with growth. They spanned a number of areas that include housing, employment, population change, and school impacts. Modelling activity is dependent on the detail and quality of data that is factored into a computer program or other analytic approach, as well as the credibility of the model assumptions. Local data -- when the forecasting began -- was limited. Much of the information needed to build a model had not previously been collected. As a result, the forecasting staff attempted to gather original information and piece together a picture of the North Country in 1986.

At that time, the modelling methodology was state-of-the-art for military impact forecasting. It seems apparent that the detailed and thorough analysis of assumptions for model input was the key factor in ensuring that the forecasts were reasonably accurate. As well, as time passed and it was apparent that fine-tuning of the impact analysis was needed, these updates further refined the forecasted numbers. With some exceptions, the efforts were accurate.

It would be our suggestion that if the process were to be carried out again, perhaps the Steering Council should also carry out some less quantitative forecasting. Perhaps a (statistically

valid) telephone survey of residents of their perceptions, attitudes and expectations could have assisted the FDSC in better identifying and dealing with social (and perhaps economic) concerns.

B. Other Task Forces

There were three other task forces that bear note, although their involvement in the planning process was limited both in duration and in contribution. These include:

- A History Task Force, whose primary effort was one of information gathering. A product of their efforts was the development of a list of names for consideration by the Army in naming streets and facilities. The full council took no action on this list, which was submitted directly to Fort Drum.
- The Agricultural Task Force targeted its efforts in two directions. The first was an effort to maintain prime agricultural lands in a continued, agricultural use. This group looked into existing legislation and land use controls, which had been used elsewhere to constrain the amount of urban development in a rural area. A second effort of this task force was one in which the agricultural and dairy products from the surrounding region would be marketed for Fort Drum consumption. This task force looked into the contracting and purchasing activity of the military to ensure that local businesses and suppliers could capitalize the post.

- The Solid Waste Task Force identified the needs for a new sanitary land fill and worked with state agencies to determine an appropriate solution. However, the landfill was only partially related to the Fort Drum buildup and it became a project handled by DANC.

APPENDIX

HISTORY AND TIMELINE

A. History

History of Fort Drum 1908-1984

This history of Fort Drum is drawn from various publications and letters. There are some inconsistencies due to multiple and sometimes contradictory sources.

I. Early Beginnings

1908

Detachments of the regular Army and the national guard, including some calvary, trained on 10,000 acres of the Pine Plains north of the Black River. The acreage had been leased for them by Watertown Chamber of Commerce. These first troops lived in tents.

1909

The 10,000 acre tract purchased by the Army.

1908 - 1940

Pine Camp, as Fort Drum was then known, was used for training nearly every summer. During these years some permanent improvements were made to the site including some barracks, an artillery range, concrete amphitheater and roads.

1934

The Watertown Chamber of Commerce assisted the Army in obtaining lease and trespass rights to a large section of the land around the camp and extending beyond the villages of Philadelphia and Antwerp. This made possible the largest peacetime military maneuvers in the U.S. up to that time. The maneuvers involved aircraft.

1935

The Chamber of Commerce bought 7,000 - 10,000 acres adjacent to the camp for a "county recreation area" at the suggestion of the Commanding Officer of the nearby Madison Barracks. The unspoken intent, to give the acreage to the Army, was carried out in 1937-38.

1938

The Watertown Chamber of Commerce re-affirmed its interest in the expansion of the camp and offered its assistance in the further acquisition of land for the Army.

II. World War II Buildup

1939

The great expansion of acreage, overseen by Lt. Gen Hugh Drum, began.

Overview 1940 - 1942

New round of property acquisitions, 1940-41, added between 97,000 and 100,000 acres to the Camp, bringing the Camp to its final complement of 107,000 acres. Some of the land sales to the Army were from very reluctant sellers. Numerous property owners and other civilians sought to purchase buildings on the properties so that the buildings, many of them houses, could be moved to a new location. The government initially refused to sell any of the buildings.

10/18/40

Secretary of War Stimson announced that Pine Camp would be home to an armored division of 15,000 troops. At the same time he announced that a cost-plus contract for the construction of the facilities for the division had been negotiated with a joint venture of two large contracting firms: John W. Cowper and Company of Buffalo and Senior Palmer Incorporated of New York City.

The contract price was \$5.8 million dollars.

The initial completion date was set for March of 1941. Land clearance and construction activities reportedly brought 4,000 construction jobs to the Camp as over 700 buildings were constructed.

10/40

Later in the month, the number of construction jobs created to construct the new post was revised downward to 3,500 jobs.

11/4/40

Barracks were constructed in a two mile by half a mile area on the pine plains of Jefferson County, long considered the "bad lands" of the area. In addition to the soldiers already based at the camp, 6,000 persons, soldiers and civilians would be on the payroll when the new 4th Armored division was assembled at the new post.

12/40

At least 75 families swelled the population of Carthage and West Carthage since work began on Pine Camp military reservation. As a result, a housing problem arose locally that caught property owners off guard. Almost all houses and apartments were taken although there were still places for boarders and those wishing to rent a single room. A number of families rented their homes and temporarily took up residence elsewhere.

1/14/41

Work continued on the construction of the post through the winter. The work reached 43% completion as the temperature dipped to 20 below zero.

6,800 construction workers were then employed on the project.

The project cost, once estimated at \$5.6 million, soared to \$12 million.

1/25/41

Amidst numerous complaints by landowners around Pine Camp over the condemnation of their land, U.S. Representative Culkin of Oswego assured his Jefferson County constituents that they would receive fair consideration for their homes and lands and he would protect their interests in all areas. He added, "You may have to make sacrifices as hundreds of other communities in the United States are doing today. That is at once a patriotic and necessary attitude for all good Americans to take."

Overview 1941-1945

The 4th Armored division was activated at Pine Camp. After the 4th was sent to war in Europe, the 5th armored division was activated at Pine Camp. Following the 5th, the 45th Infantry Division was briefly stationed Pine Camp, during the war years.

2/41

The latest construction estimate at that time forecast that the expansion of the camp and the construction of the new camp would cost just over \$20.2 million instead of the original estimate of \$5.6 million prepared by the War Department.

3/41

The original deadline for work completion on the new post was missed. However 76% of the work was done, the remainder was expected to be completed by July 1, 1941.

3/41

100 soldiers were already at the camp. 400 more were expected to arrive over the next few weeks. Following that last arrival, the planned dates for arrivals were 3,700 on 4/15; 3,800 on 5/18; 1,600 on 5/21 and 150 on 5/25. The total by June was expected to reach 9,150.

4/41

The need for 175 additional buildings was announced. Preliminary work on the buildings had already begun. The Camp would have close to 900 buildings with the completion of this 175.

6/41

The first troops of the 4th Armored Division arrived.

6/42

The U.S. Department of Justice hastily closed 400 land acquisition cases that are underway due to the expansion of Pine Camp. 175 of the cases were in contention due to questions as to ownership or fair market value. 200 other parcels were cleared through a blanket condemnation procedure.

1942

Many of the plans for the expansion of the Camp were not made known to local residents as a result of the strict censorship imposed on the expansion by a War Department (precursor to the Defense Department) that was in a wartime mode.

Congressional approval of the expansion of the standing Army to 3.6 million soldiers and the rumored further expansion to 7.0 million soldiers were hints to local residents that major changes were in the offing - especially following the major land acquisitions of the last several years.

3/43 - 5/43

1,073 civilian structures on property acquired by the government since 1940 were offered for sale. These were the houses and other buildings that former occupants and others sought to purchase over the last three years but were rebuffed by the government.

9/43 - 4/46

Italian and German prisoners of war were brought to Pine Camp. Many of the prisoners were assigned to branch work camps outside the Fort where they helped with logging, crop farming or other agricultural tasks. Most of the 1,000 Italian POWs were transferred to other U.S. locations in September, 1944. At the peak of POW activity, 1,000 German POWs were kept at the Camp while 3,000 other German POWs were placed in 18 branch camps managed by the POW administrators at Pine Camp. The last POWs left Pine Camp in April, 1946.

1948

A major military exercise "Exercise Snow Drop" took place in the winter at the Camp. The training of the 4th Armored Division in the snow seven years earlier had proved to be very useful in WW II.

12/6/51

Pine Camp was renamed Camp Drum in honor of General Hugh Drum who died earlier in 1951. General Drum was a major promoter of Pine Camp and oversaw much of its development. Governor Thomas Dewey was among those instrumental in the re-naming of the Camp for General Drum who had retired 8 years earlier.

1952

"Exercise Snow Fall", a successor to "Exercise Snow Drop" and the training of the 4th Armored Division, was conducted during the winter at the Camp.

8/53

The Army ceased operations at Camp Drum and put it on a "caretaking" status. 211 civilian employees, including summer employees, lose their jobs in September and October.

III. Search For A New Mission

11/15/59

The air force comes to Camp Drum. Detachment 11, 12th Radar Bombing Squadron (SAC), USAF (redesignated Detachment 11, First Combat Evaluation Group) is established at Camp Drum.

1960's

During the 1960's, many of the New England governors called for increased utilization of Camp Drum. One of the first was John Dempsey, Governor of Connecticut who in 1961 proposed expansion of Camp Drum to improve its capacity as a National Guard Training Center.

A tri-State Commission of Connecticut, New Jersey and New York was proposed to advocate improvements at the Camp.

Governor Dempsey's interest was a concern that the 43rd division, comprised of National Guardsmen from his and other New England states, could be downgraded to brigade status, partly due to the inadequacy of available training facilities for the 43rd at Camp Drum.

10/25/61

The Army began a study of the facilities at Camp Drum to determine what facilities, if any, needed to be expanded or improved. This was reported to be the first study of this type since 1941.

6/30/62

In the face of suggestions to cut back on the size of and support for the National Guard, the National Governors Conference heard a resolution supporting the expansion of Camp Drum. The move was spearheaded by Connecticut Governor Dempsey and supported by the six New England governors and the governors of New York and New Jersey. No decisive action was taken.

9/12/62

Modernization improvement requests totalling almost \$1,000,000 were made for Camp Drum for Fiscal Years 1963 and 1964 according to the Army.

The developments were regarded as the first impact of the modernization proposals made by eight northeastern governors in the fall of 1961.

5/19/64

U.S. Senator Kenneth Keating (NY) attempted to force the Pentagon into using Camp Drum more by suggesting that it should pay taxes on the 107,000 acres if the Army weren't going to use it more.

8/10/64

Senator Keating (NY) repeatedly advocated greater use of Camp Drum

by the Army and criticized the Army for its intention to use the facility less and ignore the 1961 Northeastern governors plan for Ft. Drum.

9/14/64

Senator Keating (NY) and senate colleagues from the Northeast got two senate committees to schedule hearings on how Drum could be better utilized by the Army. While the hearings brought the Army's thinking and analysis about the facility out into the open, little action was taken to upgrade its use.

1970's

North Country Congressman Robert C. McEwen, Senior Republican member on the Military Construction Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, obtains funding for various improvement projects at Ft. Drum.

1970's

Drum was used as a national guard training center. Some summer weeks as many as 20,000 troops were engaged in training at the camp.

1974

Camp Drum was renamed Fort Drum.

7/11/75

The Army told Congress that it would not rule out the possibility of stationing a division at Ft. Drum; however, the cost of equipping the installation could run over \$500 million. U.S. Rep. Robert Sikes (D.-Florida), then Chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, indicated that the cost and lack of existing facilities had not prevented expansion at Ft. Stewart (Georgia).

7/28/75

The Army announced plans for \$2.7 million dollars worth of permanent improvements at Drum to support the training facilities there.

7/31/75

The Army, under pressure during testimony before Reps. Sikes and McEwen, acknowledged that it is considering stationing a brigade at Fort Drum but that this is a part of a complex set of military stationing shifts that would include closing Fort Dix, New Jersey. Part of the Army's reluctance to locate at Ft. Drum stemmed from analysis that suggested that training days are severely limited by the weather. Other analysis asserted that "almost no training days are lost to the weather."

8/7/75

Rep. Robert C. McEwen and 81 congressmen from PA, NY, NJ and the

six New England states launched a major effort to open up Fort Drum for year-round use by the Army Reserve, to station more regular Army at Drum, and keep Ft. Dix open as a training center.

10/6/75

The U.S. House Appropriations Committee, in a strongly worded report, told the Army to shape up and comply with last year's request to scrutinize "with extreme care" the possibility of stationing active duty forces at Ft. Drum that could train alongside "thousands of Guard and Reserve troops who annually use the post."

2/19/76

Rep. McEwen rapped the Army's construction budgets for next year in which spending in the 9 northeastern states dropped to \$34 million from \$47 million while the spending in the 12 southern states rose from \$800 million to \$941.1 million.

6/16/76

In an unusual separate report to the U.S. House of Representatives from the House Appropriations Committee, Rep. McEwen and 8 other committee members chastised the Army for not using Ft. Drum more despite 2 years of urging by the committee. McEwen was joined by Congressmen from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

7/9/76

Rep. Robert McEwen criticized the Army for never having seriously considered stationing regular Army units at Ft. Drum.

12/8/76

U.S. Congressional investigators determined that Ft. Drum is a "grossly underutilized installation" and stated that Drum "appears ideally suited to development as a brigade or division station of the active Army." The congressional staff took issue with Army estimates as to what it would cost to relocate a division to Drum.

1/7/77

The new President of the Greater Watertown Chamber of Commerce brought together a group of community, business and military leaders to begin planning for the future expansion of Fort Drum.

1/17/77

After briefings by Rep. McEwen, Watertown and other area community leaders indicated their support for the possible location of an Army division at Drum.

2/12/77

The National Guard Adjutant Generals of nine northeastern states backed a plan assembled by Rep. McEwen calling for the location of at least a brigade at Fort Drum.

2/25/77

The Northeastern governors, headed by New York's Hugh Carey, sent a letter to President Carter calling for the president to increase military construction spending in the Northeast. The Governors specifically cite Ft. Drum as an "outstanding example of under utilized land facilities ... that readily lend themselves to use by active Army forces."

5/26/77

Under questioning about the fact that in the next fiscal year, more military construction funds were to be allocated to Georgia than the 16 northeastern and midwestern states combined, President Carter pledges fairness in the allocations of funds in the future.

6/6/77

The U.S. planned to withdraw 6,000 ground troops from South Korea by the end of 1978 according to the State Department. Fort Drum had been mentioned as a possible destination for a brigade of about 3,000 troops. A division consists of about 12,000 troops.

6/8/77

The U.S. Congress re-worked the Army budget to hold back appropriations for new or improved facilities in Korea pending the decisions on withdrawal. Coalitions of Northeast and Midwest lawmakers made it clear that the money will be reallocated to installations in those parts of the country

6/21/77

Senator Moynihan blasted the Army on training policies that resulted in a vast majority of the troops stationed in posts in the sunbelt. The correct policy, the senator says, is to station large numbers of permanent troops at Ft. Drum "Which is where they ought to be."

7/5/77

Jefferson County began a study of the possible impacts of a military expansion at Fort Drum. The study was funded by the Manpower Administration and managed by James A. Merritt, County Planning Director.

7/28/77

U.S. Rep McEwen said that the phased withdrawal of troops from Korea would fit well with a stationing of troops at Drum. He further indicated that the stationing of any parts of the 2nd Division from Korea in Drum would depend on international events that would determine whether the U.S. pulls the troops out of Korea.

9/7/77

The Army announced that it would begin a study to determine the best place for stationing the Second Infantry Division once the

division was deployed from Korea to the U.S. Fort Drum was in the running. The new Second Division would consist of two active Army Brigades and one reserve brigade.

10/77

The unofficial "Army Times" reports that Drum was under consideration as a "National Training Site." (A national training site is an installation to which the armed forces sends troops from a large region (ie: the east, south, or west) for first year training.)

10/8/77

The discussion of possible locations for a division of infantry, should they be brought back from Korea, was expanded to include Fort Indiantown Gap, Pa. Other locations in addition to Drum that were under consideration included Ft. Dix, N.J.; Ft. Devens, Ma; Ft. Bliss, Tx; and Ft. Benning, Ga. In some proposals a division would be split between two forts.

10/22/77

Saratoga Associates began a study of the military impacts on the area, funded jointly by the Watertown Foundation and the Community Savings Bank.

10/22/77

Fort Drum was designated by the Army as a contender in the contest for a national training center site for major units in the east and south. The training center would permit units, up to a brigade in strength, to fire all of their major weapons during training exercises. The Fort would store equipment permanently for use by visiting units.

11/3/77

The Committee Against Fort Drum Expansion meets in public for the first time. The meeting drew a crowd of 45 and led to the selection of a 12-person steering committee to plan future activities.

11/8/77

Reports in the unofficial "Army Times" newspaper said that Fort Drum has been dropped out of the running as one of the new national training sites. Reasons given included: the installation was too small for mechanized divisions to train and it was not convenient to any Tactical Air Command posts.

The unofficial loss of the national training site was considered a mixed blessing as the designation could preclude the stationing of a division at Drum.

11/18/77

Attorney Jack Scordo of Watertown, a member of the Committee Against Permanent Fort Drum Expansion, charged that the Jefferson

County Board of Supervisors had made Fort Drum Expansion appear to be the only possible economic boost for the region. He charged "The Board of Supervisors is looking backwards... The blame rests with them because they have not given us an alternative."

11/29/77

The northeastern governors passed a resolution calling for the relocation of any Army units from Korea to the northeast. The resolution was worded in a way that suggests that only Ft. Drum would be the place to put a division.

12/29/77

The expansion of Fort Drum to accommodate the 2nd Infantry Division to be moved from Korea would bring an increase of 38,500 people to the north country according to a study by Saratoga Associates. If any part of the division were to be re-located to Drum, at least 6,500 people would be brought to the area.

1/19/78

Key congressional leaders favored the President's plan to begin a phased withdrawal of troops from South Korea. The expectation is that a 6,000 troop brigade could be withdrawn by the end of 1978.

4/25/78

President Carter sharply slowed the proposed pace of troop relocation from Korea. He had originally said that he would withdraw 6,000 of the 30,000 troops this year. Now plans called for withdrawing only 800 and the 800 would leave their equipment behind.

4/29/78

The number of relocation options for the second division from Korea had been narrowed to four and any of these options would mean an increased utilization of Ft. Drum.

5/10/78

The Army's Chief of Staff suggested that the troops that returned from Korea would still have a Korean orientation (for possible action there). This was seen as reducing hopes for the stationing of the troops at Drum.

6/27/78

Aides to Gov. Carey said that the Army had selected Ft. Drum for at least part of a division scheduled to return to the U.S. from Korea.

6/21/79

Rep. McEwen rapped the Pentagon for concentrating military activities in a few states. Three states each received half a billion dollars a year while other states received small amounts.

7/26/79

The relocation of the 44th Engineer Battalion to Drum from Korea, already temporarily delayed, was further delayed by a law that prohibits the reduction of forces in Korea below a certain figure.

1/11/80

Mayor Karl Burns of Watertown held a meeting of local officials including assemblymen, economic development directors, and representatives of the three counties. The meeting was a strategy session to determine how up to 3,000 units of housing (though the Army would probably require only 1,445 units of family housing) could be built for the engineering battalion that was expected to move to Drum from Korea. Congressman McEwen indicated that the troop movements could accelerate if the housing was ready sooner rather than later.

1/11/80

Watertown City Manager said that a fund of \$1.3 million for housing rehabilitation was not suitable for use in the provision of Army housing. Speaking for the city, he said that the private sector would have to provide rental housing for the Army.

4/80

B Company, 76th Engineer Battalion was reassigned to Ft. Drum from Ft. Mead, Maryland.

7/29/80

The Army chief of Staff indicated that Ft. Drum could be given future consideration as a possible East Coast National Training Center. But for now, he stated that the priority should be to "round out" plans for the arrival of the engineering battalion from Korea. Transfer of this battalion was projected to be completed by 1982 or, at the latest, 1983.

1980

553rd Engineer Detachment was stationed at Drum.

10/22/80

Secretary of the Army, John Marsh, announced plans for facilities expansions at Ft. Drum that provide for its increasing role as a training center. At the news conference, then - Assemblyman Martin (who was seeking to succeed Congressman McEwen) pressed for more expansion.

2/81

Newly-elected Representative Martin commenced a series of discussions and meetings with newly-appointed Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and Secretary of the Army John O. Marsh, Jr. concerning increased Army utilization of Fort Drum.

8/24/81

The Director of Engineering and the Director of Planning for Ft. Drum reported to a citizens group that a new 300 person barracks was nearing completion; also planned -- a new athletic center, and a new fire station - all over the next three years. Currently, 586 military and 885 civilians worked at the post.

11/81

President Reagan, in an Oval Office meeting with Representative Martin, outlined in detail a series of problems caused the United States by the illegal immigration of thousands of Haitians fleeing their country on makeshift boats and rafts in hopes of reaching the United States. He identified Fort Drum as a potential site for temporarily detaining an estimated 5,000 refugees despite some initial reluctance to do so by the Department of Defense. The President agreed to a to-be-determined military construction build up of Fort Drum upon the departure of the illegal refugees.

Representative Martin outlined a proposal to local leaders at a town meeting in Watertown and visited existing refugee detention sites in Puerto Rico, Arkansas, and St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, D.C.

12/81

As the Haitian boat lift reduced in intensity, the need for the Fort Drum facilities greatly lessened; the proposal was cancelled and a substitute -- Glasgow, Montana -- site was identified.

Representative Martin hailed the decision to remove Fort Drum from further consideration. As the remaining detainees, many of whom were prisoners freed from Cuban jails by Fidel Castro, could have been a security threat to the local populace. This, he said, outweighed any economic benefits that would have been realized by their presence.

10/83

Army commenced planning of Light Infantry Division.

1/84

Army began discussion of Light Infantry Division (LID) initiatives in communications to the Congress.

1/84

Army formally notified Congress of intent to form LIDs; Fort Drum clearly identified as a candidate site.

2-3/84

The Army Chief of Staff, General John Wickham, briefed the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees on plans for the LIDs.

Rep. Martin briefed Governor Cuomo and Northern New York Assemblymen and State Senators on LID initiative and receives their active support.

Fort Drum commander was notified of potential role for Fort Drum in various options under consideration by Department of the Army in stationing of Light Infantry Division.

2/84

Rep. Martin commenced eight-month series of private meetings and conversations with the White House, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army and the Army Chief of Staff to stress the strategic and military advantages of Fort Drum, the long history of the military presence in Northern New York and state and community support.

2/13/84

Rep. Martin contacted Northern New York's mayors, county supervisors and legislators urging that they convey community support to the Department of Defense; numerous letters and resolutions received in response to the request were shared with the Secretaries of Defense and the Army during the following months.

2/21/84

Rep. Martin and Assemblyman H. Robert Nortz met with Secretary of Defense Weinberger to discuss support of New York State Legislature for stationing a LID at Ft. Drum.

2/27/84

Rep. Martin briefed full New York State Congressional Delegation on Fort Drum initiative. Delegation voted to support the effort and advises President Reagan accordingly.

3/7/84

New York State Legislature passed Resolutions in support of Fort Drum's selection.

3/7/84

Vice President Bush formally acknowledged the efforts on behalf of Fort Drum and established dialogue with Rep. Martin on the New York initiative.

3/8-13/84

Chief of Staff of the Army and others briefed House Appropriations Committee on Army plans for the LIDs, again clearly identifying Fort Drum as a candidate for stationing a LID.

3/14-15/84

Rep. Martin presented his report, "Advantages to Stationing A Light Infantry Division at Fort Drum," and Governor Cuomo's "The Case for

Fort Drum" to the Department of Defense.

3-5/84

Rep. Martin continued dialogue with Departments of Defense and Army stressing continuing support of the state and local communities.

4/4/84

It is announced in Washington that Fort Drum has emerged as the leading candidate to house all or part of a new light infantry division. Local support rallied for two hearings to be held in Watertown preliminary to the Environmental Impact Hearings on the various stationing alternatives.

4/18/84

The first preliminary hearing scoping session was held at the State Office Building. 225 people turned out. Only one of 45 speakers registered any opposition to the proposal. The issues raised -- schools, hospitals, infrastructure, water, human services, etc. - were to be included in a preliminary Environmental Impact Statement.

5/31/84

Cary R. Brick, chief of staff to Rep. Martin, organized and chaired meeting of ad-hoc Fort Drum Steering Committee to coordinate presentations at June 13 EIS hearing in Watertown; attendees included; Donald C. Alexander and James E. Brett (community and civic organizations); T. Urling Walker (local governments); John B. Johnson, Jr. (media); James A. Merritt (county government) and Patrick Evans (Chamber of Commerce). Meeting held at Fort Drum NCO Club following Col. David Hannum's Change of Command ceremony. Rep. Martin met personally with group on June 7 and by telephone on June 12.

6/6/84

Rep. Martin met with Senator Sam Nunn (Senate Armed Services Committee), D-Ga., and Congressman Richard Ray (House Armed Services Committee), D-Ga. to discuss the siting alternative linking Fort Benning, Ga; and Fort Drum. They agreed to actively support the Fort Drum initiative.

6/12/84

Rep. Martin and Governor Cuomo confer in Washington and met with Secretary of the Army Marsh. Both appeared at EIS hearing in Watertown the following day.

6/13/84

The Army Corps of Engineers holds an Environmental Impact Statement hearing in the Watertown High School Auditorium. 300 persons attended the hearing, which lasted past midnight. 55 spoke (including the Governor). Three of the speakers registered opposition to the proposal. The support of the local citizenry

for the proposal was clear to the Army Corps of Engineers. State, local and federal officials promised vast resources to help accommodate the soldiers and their families. Governor Cuomo pledged state resources to see the project through to successful completion.

6/19-20/84

Rep. Martin met at White House with Chief of Staff James Baker and at Pentagon with Deputy Secretary of Defense William H. Taft to discuss progress of local initiative.

6/25/84

Rep. Martin and Rep. Samuel S. Stratton, Dean of the New York Congressional Delegation, met with Secretary of Defense Weinberger to discuss progress of local initiative.

6/28/84

Rep. Martin hosted meeting of New York, Georgia and Alabama Congressional delegations to discuss the LID stationing. The Delegations agree to support an East Coast stationing and that if the Division is split, a Fort Drum/Benning option would be preferable.

6/84

Community leaders, concerned about under-utilized hospitals in the impact area, urged the Army not to build its own hospital on Ft. Drum. Discussions began which eventually resulted in agreement that the Army would use community hospitals; only maintaining out-patient clinics on-post.

Similarly, community leaders recommended that existing public school facilities be used instead of constructing a new on-post school.

7/84

New York, Georgia and Alabama Congressional Delegations advised Secretaries of Defense and the Army of their June 28 meeting and agreements.

7/84

Rep. Martin and Rep. Richard Ray, D-Ga., agreed to coordinate visit of Fort Benning, Ga. area business leaders to Fort Drum area.

8/84

Newspaper stories reported promises of cooperation between the Watertown and Fort Benning area business communities. These were shared with the Secretaries of Defense and the Army.

8/84

At Fort Gillem, Georgia, planning activities began for stationing a division at Ft. Drum. The Army decided to use 801 housing (a program approved by congress in 1983) for Ft. Drum expansion.

Aside from one small project elsewhere, Ft. Drum would be the first major utilization of the 801 program. (Ideas to have the entire project built by - and owned by - one contractor/investor team were considered but eventually discarded.)

8/28/84

Congress authorizes the initial 600 units of Section 801 housing "ifnecessary..... to provide sufficient family housing to accommodate a major restationing action by the Army."

9/11/84

Governor Cuomo, in the letter to the Secretary of Defense, provided details concerning the types of state assistance New York will pledge to support location of a LID at Ft. Drum.

9/11/84

Department of Defense formally accepted Army's plans to create new LIDs in 1985 and 1986.

9/11/84

Rep. Martin announced selection of Fort Drum as the Army's preferred choice for the stationing of The 10th Mountain Division.

9/13/84

Senate Appropriations Committee's Defense Subcommittee was briefed in detail on stationing plans for 10th Infantry Division.

9/28/84

Final Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register.

10/10/84

Congress authorized the Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts for an additional 1,200 family housing units, identifying specifically Fort Drum, with other locations, in order to accommodate the stationing of the Light Infantry Divisions.

11/16/84

Secretary of the Army formally confirmed Fort Drum's selection for stationing the Army's 17 active component division.

Summary:

The past history of Fort Drum is one of ups and downs. Military buildups have created growth and opportunity ... and the opposite has occurred in the down periods. Several years of letting the post become essentially "fallow", combined with the downturn of the regional economy, left the North Country particularly vulnerable to new ideas for use of the post. Yet for years the efforts of the political representatives to put the post to more active use bore little fruit.

It was a somewhat skeptical community which heard the rumors and actual decisions concerning the 10th Mountain Division stationing. Years of disappointment gave the people a "show me" attitude; an attitude which wanted to avoid further disappointment until something tangible happened. The need for the Fort Drum community in late 1984 was one of coordinated, cooperative effort. It thus required a herculean effort to pull together all the proactive elements of planning and impact mitigation to ensure that the Army's buildup could be accommodated in the Watertown region. The following timeline outlines the basic, underlying activities that were undertaken. Later chapters provide further detail.

B. TIMELINE

The Development of Fort Drum as the home for the 10th Division

8/84

The final Environmental Impact Statement on the "Stationing of a New Light Infantry Division" came out.

9/8/84

First residential building permit of 1984 was issued within the City of Watertown. This fact is often-quoted during the build-up years to show the scope of the economic turn-around in the impact area.

9/11/84

Congressman Martin announced that Ft. Drum will be the division's preferred choice for a new division. One infantry brigade would temporarily be posted at Fort Benning in Georgia.

9/11/84

Planning efforts began in the New York District.

9/84

Ft. Drum Commander announced decision to build 801 housing off post.

10/84

Jefferson County Board of Supervisors passed resolution to form a Steering Council (SC). (Within several months the full shape and membership of the Council and its committees was clarified. Local jurisdictions with representation on the SC have not all approved the terms of their membership.)

10/84

Drum Area Council of Governments formed.

10/17/84

SC planning began in earnest, and first seven task forces formed soon after.

11/1/84

Public meeting at Jefferson Community College: decision to scatter 801 housing in 3-county area based on community input.

11/20/84

The selection of Drum is made official when the Secretary of the Army signed the order assigning the new division to Fort Drum.

12/84

First RFP for 801 Housing leases was issued by Norfolk District, Army Corps. of Engineers (1,400 units): 600 dwelling units in Watertown; 800 elsewhere in the impact area, with at least 150 to be in St. Lawrence county and 150 in Lewis County. The Norfolk Corps coordinated the RFP process, the New York District office implemented two RFPs; 600 in Watertown; remainder in other county areas - Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence.

Late '84/Early '85

The New York State Division for Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR) opened regional office in Watertown, in preparation for dealing with the expected impacts of Ft. Drum expansion.

Late '84

Governor Cuomo formed governors task force on Fort Drum and charged state officials to find ways to assist Fort Drum expansion. Decision not to build hospital on Fort Drum.

12/84

Army revised buildup schedule from two years to four years, and commanding general and staff of 10th Mountain Division arrived at Fort Drum.

1/85

Secretary Of Army, Chief of Staff of Army announcement that housing was the pacing factor. General Carpenter announced this to the community. Infrastructure also identified as a development/buildup constraint.

Early '85

Local leaders visited other military growth impact areas. (Bremmerton, WA and Kings Bay, Georgia and Fort Stewart) to learn how each community managed the growth.

1/85

Visits to other military installations to identified lessons learned during buildup. Sparked concern about transients.

1/19/85

Structural Associates of Syracuse submitted the low bid for the first phase of a five-phase renovation of existing Drum facilities for interim use. This phase includes some 45 barracks and 8 mess halls for \$3.3 million.

2/85

Master planning and design of the new post began in earnest.

2/13/85

10th Mountain Division was activated in ceremonies of Fort Drum.

3/85

Portions of 31 barracks added 1.8 million to the first phase construction.

3/85

The SC Executive Committee members supported the concept of a regional development authority to handle water, sewage, garbage, and regional airport. General Schroeder voiced his support for the idea and suggested that a long term use agreement by the Army could be used to sell bonds, assuming the facilities construction can be done in a timely manner.

(Only the State Legislature has the power to create such an authority.)

3/85

Steering Council endorsed a move by its executive committee to agree in principal with the Army that the Army would become a major customer in a regional sewer, water, and solid waste infrastructure.

Brig. Gen. Schroeder needed the agreement for budgeting purposes. The Army's agreement made selling bonds easier for a regional authority that could be formed with state approval.

3/2/85

The City of Watertown indicated that it felt left out of the efforts to create a Fort Drum Regional Development Authority (the precursor to DANC - Development Authority of the North Country). Others suggested that the city is dragging its feet on the subject. The City Manager indicate that the city needed to be induced to participate in DANC or any other Authority. Possible inducements include the right to annex property adjacent to the city and/or giving the city the right to set up a municipal power company.

The City Manager indicated that he thought the city was underrepresented on the SC and that the city should have a seat on the SC Executive Committee. The SC indicated that it would consider these requests.

3/6/85

Bids opened on the second phase of the Ft. Drum barracks renovation work. The low bidder was Northland Construction of Syracuse. This phase consists of 40 supply and administration buildings. Despite the opening of the bids, a contract could not be awarded until the necessary military construction funds were released.

3/30/85

The DACOG (Drum Area Council of Governments) formed a committee to study its response to the idea of a Regional Development Authority. The initial response is very positive.

4/5/85

The state committed \$500,000 in its budget to the Regional Development Authority, now known as DANC - if a DANC is approved.

4/13/85

Additional engineering and architectural firms were sought by the Army for "indefinite quantity" renovation projects to fast track planning. (Firms are used on a time and expense basis to generate design solutions.)

4/19/85

Iversen Construction Company of Gorham, New York, submitted a low bid of \$3.7 million to build the new physical fitness center to include an indoor pool at Drum. Project was already on the books.

4/27/85

DACOG asked the SC for its support of the DANC Proposal and expressed concern that "time is slipping by very rapidly" and not much progress was being made on the DANC proposal. Concern was expressed that the Army may pull out and build their own water and sewage facilities.

4/85

Formation of Fort Drum Land Use Team with funds provided by New York State Department of State.

5/85

The \$1.4 million contract for the phase two renovation of Drum was awarded to Northland Construction.

5/10/85

Lewis County objected to what it considered insufficient representation on the DANC or Development Authority of the North Country.

Under the present plan, Lewis and St. Lawrence Counties would each have two reps on DANC. The City of Watertown would also have two reps on DANC and Jefferson County would have three reps.

Lewis County was already displeased with its level of representation on the SC, one rep.

5/11/85

DACOG criticized DANC's makeup saying two reps from Lewis and St. Lawrence Counties are too many.

5/22/85

The city of Watertown and St. Lawrence County fought over the number of reps that each should have on the DANC board. The city insisted on having the same number as St. Lawrence County; the County wanted more reps than the city.

The idea that membership on the DANC board be tied to financial

support of the board put a new twist on the argument and sent everyone back to their respective corners. No one wanted to be committed to paying for DANC.

The SC approved language in the proposed legislation creating DANC, supporting the concept and allowing DANC to sell bonds for waste, sewer, electricity, water, transportation, recreation and certain industrial development facilities.

In addition the language approved also allowed for the condemnation of property in a municipality over the objections of that municipality. (This last provision is later removed.)

5/23/85

Armed with a survey indicating that rents have risen 25 to 30% since February and showing a current Jefferson County housing vacancy rate of 3%, the SC passed a resolution calling for "affordable, conscientious rents." The council expressed concern about price-gouging for the military (since most of the soldiers cannot afford what landlords now expect them to pay), and about the displacement of low income and the elderly to provide space for the military.

There had been some talk of asking state legislators to include Jefferson County under the state's Emergency Tenant Protection Act, an act that regulates fair market rental rates and limits rent increases. The act applies only when the vacancy rate in a county is under 5%. The proposal was soundly rejected.

5/25/85

The State Legislature had to act on any DANC proposal prior to adjournment within the next two weeks.

The SC voted for a final DANC proposal that included equal representation for each of the three counties and the City of Watertown (2 each) on the DANC board. St Lawrence County's rep did not attend the SC meeting as he had not had time to consult with the other St. Lawrence County Legislators.

5/30/85

Housing and medical facilities were added to the bonding authority of the proposed DANC, but medical facilities were eliminated by the Legislature and the Governor in considering the bill.

5/29/85

Members of the St. Lawrence County Board of Legislators reacted negatively to the latest draft legislation creating DANC, indicating that their representation was inadequate and that few of the proposed projects that would be undertaken by DANC would benefit St. Lawrence County. They maintained that most of those benefits to DANC could be accomplished by the county itself with no loss of project control.

6/12/85

Representative David Martin met with the SC at its meeting in Gouverneur to encourage the St. Lawrence representatives to support and participate in the DANC proposal.

A commitment of \$125,000 for the SC was announced by Martin. Representatives of the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) were on hand to sign the paperwork needed to expedite the funding, and to enable the formal activities to continue to proceed. Jefferson County was nominated to receive the OEA funds. The county agreed to provide various administrative support services to the Steering Council.

6/12/85

The bill enabling DANC underwent further revision in Albany by the New York Senate, Assembly and Governor. A final bill could be ready within a week. Prior to adopting the final bill, the three county legislatures involved will be required by the state to issue home rule messages approving the bill.

6/18/85

Representative David Martin met separately with the Democratic and Republican caucuses of the St. Lawrence County Legislature to urge support of the DANC proposal after a poll of the county legislature indicated that no one on the legislature is willing to support the proposal.

6/25/85

Bids were opened for phase three of the buildings renovation contract for Drum.

6/85

DANC billed was passed. Governor Cuomo came to Watertown to sign it. This highly unusual step was used by the Governor to demonstrate his personal committment to facilitating the successful completion of the new Fort Drum.

6/85

Secretary of the Army announced that the 27th Infantry Brigade, New York National Guard will be the "roundout" of the 10th Mountain Division.

6/28/85

In activation of the 76th Engineer Battalion, the first major active duty unit stationed at Ft. Drum were completed.

7/85

Firm's wishing to bid on the construction had fewer than 30 days to respond to an RFQ to be released later in that month for concept design and final design.

It was estimated that the winners had 5 months to complete design

with a mix of firms including some who have never done Department of Defense (DoD) work.

7/26/85

The Corp of Engineers advertised for RFQs from engineers and architects to complete approximately \$500 million in new construction at Drum.

RFQ deadline is August 12.

Scope of work included more than 70 projects.

For each project, timing and phasing estimates were: 5 months for concept design, and 5 months for design documents. Project was scheduled to start in 1985, with completion scheduled in November 1986.

8/85

First 801 housing contracts awarded to LUK and WDC for 1,400 units.

8/17/85

The five-phase renovation, costing \$27 million, of more than 300 older structures on the post for interim use was underway.

The \$3.3 million first phase contract was for 45 barracks and 6 mess halls and was being done by Structural Associates of Syracuse.

The \$1.4 million second phase contract was for 40 administration buildings by Northland Associates of Syracuse.

The third phase was divided into five separate contracts- \$298,877 for the renovation of a building into a Key Bank Branch by Northland Associates and construction of a worldwide communications building-\$342,000 for six chapels and religious education buildings also by Northland- \$730,730 for eight medical buildings by Ritchie Brothers of Gouverneur- \$1,042,539 for 4 classroom buildings and 7 buildings for the corp of engineers. The bids for the fifth part of phase 3 were not yet open.

The \$8.5 million fourth phase was for 80 barracks and 8 mess halls to be done by Alekna Construction of Endicott.

Bids on the final phase of between \$5 and \$10 million dollars were not yet open and will cover about 100 buildings for administrative use.

8/25/85

LUK signed contract with the Army for 1,000 units of 801 housing. The expectation was that the first units will be completed by 6/86-7/86.

8/85

Regional land use policies were adopted by Jefferson County. A set of criteria was established.

Fall/85

Special State Legislation was enacted to assist schools experiencing rapid military-related student growth. A one-time payment would be made to impacted school districts to offset the

normal one-year delay in aid increases based on attendance figures. \$12 million resulted.

8/28/85

LUK signed the first agreement to lease housing units to the Army under the 801 program. LUK would provide 1,000 units of 801 housing at 7 sites.

9/85

WDC signed contract with the Army for 400 units of 801 housing.

9/4/85

Bids on the fifth and final phase of the renovation work at Drum were opened.

9/28/85

The \$4.8 million dollar low bids for road repairs and construction of 1 obstacle course were opened this week.

11/15/85

The bid deadline for the heating plant, originally scheduled for October 15, 1985 and moved to today was extended again to December 6, 1985. The delays were due to changes in the specifications.

11/85

State agreed not to decertify hospital beds at the six hospitals serving the impact area. While the hospitals had excess capacity, it was felt that needs could increase due to population growth associated with the Ft. Drum build-up. When excess capacity continued, local failure to decertify the beds resulted in threatened fines and misunderstandings.

12/85

Construction started on Clayton 801 (LUK) housing project.

12/85

First Fiscal Impact Study by the Office of Economic Adjustment began.

12/6/85

The new heating plant bids were opened today.

12/85

At a pre-proposal conference for on-post housing construction for 1986 construction the Army discussed plans for a total of 800 units (later changed to 700) to be built for about \$56 million dollars. The first 400 were expected to be completed within a year of the contract award with April 1987 as the target date.

12/9/85

The Army announced that it was considering leasing up to 260 houses, motel rooms, and trailers to house military families arriving this winter and spring to prevent a slowdown in troop deployment.

The rents would probably range between \$450 and \$1,000.

12/13/85

The Corps of Engineers announced that \$250 million in construction contracts will be awarded in early 1986. An industry briefing would be held in February or March of 1986 to announce plans for fiscal 1987 which were expected to include a major contract of \$500 to \$600 million and a separate \$100 million contract.

The plan at the time was that the project would be advertised before October 1, 1986; awarded by March 1987 and ground breaking by April 1987.

Other bids that will be solicited in the first and second quarters of 10/86 will be for \$60 million for more roads, electrical, sewer, hot water and other "horizontal infrastructure"; multi-million for a new mall for the commissary and PX; and projects to be built with non-appropriated funds such as a bowling center, skill development center, auto craft center, and athletic fields.

Source of money included reappropriation of unexpended military funds from around the world.

1/86

Public Transportation study (CENTRO) began.

1/4/86

Construction of 126 units of Section 801 housing in Carthage was halted as the result of a dispute over a tax payment schedule between the builder, WDC, and the village.

1/22/86

A man who had staged protests before started a campaign for a city-wide tenants rights organization to unite the poor against rising rents and evictions they faced as a result of the expansion of Ft. Drum. Program recommendations did not materialize, but this event marked the beginning of quality of life issues associated with the buildup.

1/86

Formation of 801 Task Force to negotiate PILOT agreements with developers.

2/86

Construction started on Academy Street (Watertown) 801 (LUK) housing project.

2/86

First Fiscal Impact Study by the Office of Economic Adjustment was completed.

2/28/86

Contractors and suppliers got their first look at the preliminary specifications for the New Fort Drum at a presentation in New York City. The Corps intended to award a single major contract by February of 1987.

The importance of small, minority, and women owned sub-contractors was emphasized.

3/86

Construction started on Copenhagen 801 (LUK) housing project.

3/86

First NY State Housing Finance Agency Housing Market Analysis began.

4/86

Creation of Small Business Development Center at JCC.

4/86

Construction started on Eastern Boulevard (Watertown) 801 (LUK) housing project.

4/86

Second RFP for 801 Housing leases were issued by Norfolk District, Army Corps of Engineers (300 units).

4/3/86

The Army reached the 50-unit point in its program to lease apartments and houses off-post, which would satisfy needs until completion of on-post housing and the 801 units. The leases ranged from 3 months to a year but most are for a year's time.

4/12/86

After initiating a search for additional apartments and houses to rent on a short term basis (pending completion of 801 and on-post housing), General Carpenter cancels plans to lease more units on 6 month leases. The General identified need for daily leases that the Army can use on an as needed basis.

Spring '86

County Route 29 controversy began concerning the proposed occasional closing of the highway through the post during certain military activities.

Spring '86

Route 11 use and expansion controversy is addressed by community.

5/86

Construction started on Arsenal Street (Watertown) 801 (LUK) housing project.

5/6/86

The Army received permission to lease an additional 60 houses and apartments for soldiers.

5/6/86

General Carpenter delivered a recommendation to the U.S. Forces Command that the arrival of new soldiers at Drum be slowed or temporarily halted until the housing picture improves.

5/6/86

Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) Negotiations between area communities and the developers of 801 housing ceased.

5/16/85

National Structures (subsidiary of Morrison-Knudson) began "moving earth" preliminary to the start of construction of 700 units of housing on-post. The \$50.1 million dollar contract called for National Structures to deliver 100 units on the first day of each of April, May, June, July, September, and October 1987. The remaining 100 units would be delivered in the first quarter of 1988.

5/23/86

PILOT Agreements were reached between some communities around Watertown and the developers of 801 projects in those communities. An agreement still has not been reached between Watertown and LUK, the designated developer of 600 units in Watertown, Carthage, and Gouverneur.

5/29/86

Army real estate experts combed the tri-county area in an effort to find 310 additional rental apartments or houses. The results of this effort were expected to greatly influence the Army's impending decision on whether or not troop arrivals should be delayed.

6/7/86

Army prepared to sign 100 of the first 350 short term apartment and house leases it needed by September.

The Army estimated that the leased housing program will peak at around 250 units between now and 1987.

Most, if not all of the reasons behind the need for the interim leases, were the result of delays in the construction of the 801 housing program projects.

Some of the temporary housing quarters used at the present time were very substandard. For example, 21 families were living in an old barracks and sharing one stove and common bathrooms.

6/7/86

Army officials said they will meet with representatives of LUK (one of the builders of 801 housing) the following week to review the firms reasons for the three month delays in the construction of housing. The developer faced fines of \$40.00/day for every unit it failed to have ready by Aug 30.

Much of the delay had been due to PILOT (Payment In Lieu Of Taxes) negotiations with the municipalities.

If the Village of Copenhagen did not receive a \$400,000 federal block grant, the community may not be able to support 75 801 units planned for that site. Copenhagen's allocation of 801 units needed to be parcelled out to other communities. The Village of Copenhagen received a donation anonymously and the Village built its own water project.

6/13/86

A contract for the collection and disposal of sewage was signed between the Army and DANC. DANC was expected to award contracts for the construction of a pipeline between Ft. Drum and Watertown where the treatment plant is located.

6/86

Ground breaking for infrastructure contract.

6/86

24 units of LUK 801 housing accepted/occupied in Clayton.

7/86

The boundaries for School Districts were redefined through new Ft. Drum cantonment area dividing family housing units between Carthage and Indian River School District.

7/16/86

The second pre-proposal conference for potential bidders on the FY87 Facilities Contract was held.

Potential bidders on the contract began to form joint ventures.

7/22/86

Pilot Agreement signed for Watertown LUK - 801 housing projects (Eastern, Arsenal, and Academy).

7/86

FDSC developed school impact model which projected impact of Ft. Drum expansion on each school district.

8/86

Construction started on Philadelphia LUK - 801 housing project.

8/86

The joint ventures formed to build the new post submitted detailed management plans explaining how they would oversee the massive project.

8/7/86

Pilot agreement signed for Copenhagen LUK - 801 housing project.

8/11/86

Pilot Agreement signed for Philadelphia LUK - 801 project.

8/22/86

Pilot Agreement signed for Clayton LUK - 801 housing project.

Fall/86

Opening and occupancy of Clayton 801 units -- first in county to reach actual occupancy.

9/86

Implementation of CHAMPUS demonstration project.

This program provided direct medical co-payments to active military personnel at Ft. Drum who were required to purchase off-post medical services (due to the lack of a post hospital).

10/9/86

The third and final pre-proposal conference for bidders on the new post contract was held.

The Corps of Engineers targeted the end of October '86 as the award date. The winning joint venture was expected to begin work within 6 days of the award.

10/86

Funding was approved by Congress for the new post construction project. Congress authorized \$180 million for FY 1987, \$221 million for FY 1988, and \$214 for FY 1989.

10/86

Architectural layout was determined for post.

Late '86

SUNY - Ft. Drum - North Country consortium of colleges established to provide bachelors and masters degree programs locally.

10/86

Cumulative population projections released by the Army were:

	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89
Military	1200	3200	6700	9400	10600
Army Families	750	1800	3600	5200	5800
Family Members	1650	4900	9300	13700	15100
Civilians	<u>1100</u>	<u>1500</u>	<u>1800</u>	<u>1900</u>	<u>2000</u>
Total	3950	9600	17800	25000	27700

Note: Some listings overlap.

10/86

Estimates of construction costs (including private projects - ie: 801) for Ft. Drum facilities were:

FY 85	\$ 5.0 million
FY 86	280.0 million
FY 87+	615.0 million

Total estimated construction costs 1.1 billion.

10/86

Expansion was expected to create 6,300 new civilian jobs between 1985-1990 including 2,000 federal jobs.

10/86 Demographics of minority soldiers were released:

- 24.0% are black
- 3.6% are hispanic
- 6.0% are women
- 1.3% other

The average number of children per soldier was .84 for a total of 9,000 children. Half would be of school age (4,500), 78% will be under age 11.

10/86

Wage totals and projections for FY 84, 85, and 90 were \$31 million, \$44 million, and \$221 million respectively.

10/86

WDC opened first 24 units in West Carthage project.

10/30/86

LUK finished the Clayton 801 housing project.

Fall/86

Gates-Rainaldi Award (300 DU) for 801 development in LeRay.

11/19/86

The new post joint ventures submitted their first price and technical proposals.

A 27 member evaluation team, sworn to secrecy and secluded, began their evaluation of the proposals.

The Corps of Engineers pared the contract to fit the budget, reworking elements of the design and construction schedule.

A total of four joint ventures emerged from the intra-contractors private negotiations.

12/86

Construction started on Gouverneur 801 (LUK) housing project.

12/86

The first of at least three "Housing Demand/Need Analysis of the Impact of the Fort Drum Expansion" a study by the New York State Housing Finance Agency, Office of Housing and Technical Services came out.

12/20/86

In response to an urgent request, Congress was asked to double the posts number of private apartment and house leases by permitting 350 more leases.

This was the result of delays in the construction of Army sponsored housing on and off of the post.

This move was expected to put the Army's housing needs in direct conflict with the civilian housing needs that were expected to grow greatly in the spring when construction on the post was fully underway.

A lease cap of \$500 a month is set.

12/24/86

Fort Drum's request to lease an additional 350 more apartments and homes was approved by the Congress.

1/87

FDSC developed and released housing master plan.

1/87

Construction was completed at LUK - 801 housing Eastern (Watertown) site.

1/87

Construction was completed at LUK - 801 housing Academy (Watertown) site.

1/87

Public Transportation study completed by CENTRO.

1/16/87

WDC opened remainder of West Carthage 801 housing project.

1/15/87

314 of 700 units of an on-post housing project were completed.

1/25/87

A study by the State of New York's Housing Finance Agency (HFA) indicated that despite anticipated housing production, a gap of 3,800 rental and 300 for-sale units would remain in the Ft. Drum impact area as the number of households grows by 23% through 1990. One of the major findings of this report was that non-military families had the greatest need. 3,500 of the rental units were seen as below market rate rental units. The breakdown for 3,500 units included 2,100 for non-military families, 600 for military families, and 800 for the elderly. The overall gap included a need for between 1,500 and 2,900 units with subsidies for low income households.

This study also indicated that the median price for a house in the Tri-County area would have doubled by 1990. The median was \$27,000 in 1980; \$42,000 by 1986; and was expected to reach \$57,000 by 1990.

The study also indicated that the median rent on a 1 or 2 bedroom apartment, set at \$307 in the fall of 1986 was expected to increase 55 to 65 percent to \$480 to \$515 by the end of the decade (not including utilities). Between 1980 and 1986, rents in apartment buildings doubled from \$140 to \$297/month. This was an average annual increase of 19%.

1/28/87

LUK finished 120 units of 801 housing at Academy Street in Watertown.

2/87

Construction was completed at LUK - 801 housing Copenhagen site.

2/3/87

Jefferson County appointed a full-time county administrator.

2/6/87

The Updated Fiscal Impact Analysis for Ft. Drum was released by the Steering Council. This report was bottom up in impact projection whereas the first Fiscal Impact Analysis was top down.

This analysis concluded:

- o There would be 29,600 in-migrants by 1990.
- o Some jurisdictions would have negative cash flows in operating budget through 1990 as a result of the population influx.
- o 70% of the population growth would come in 1987-88.

- o The population makeup was projected to be 9,600 soldiers, 5,000 spouses, and over 8,700 children. This totals to over 23,400 military and family members. In addition, there would be an increase of 6,1000 civilian including 1,500 children.
- o In total there would be over 10,000 new children, 40% of whom will be pre-school. The result would be a new student enrollment of 5,800 students; 3,900 in K-6. Six school districts: Watertown, Indian River, Carthage, General Brown, Thousand Islands, and Copenhagen would share 85% of the children. The six schools together would experience negative cash flows for the first two years. The PILOT agreements were expected to alleviate much of this.
- o 11,250 of the 29,600 would be living on Ft. Drum. The majority of the remaining 18,350 would be scattered throughout 42 different jurisdictions within 30 miles. Of these communities, 48% would experience population growth of fewer than 200 people; 33% would experience growth of between 200 and 500; and the remaining seven communities would receive 60% of the total off post population, they and their percentage increase are:

Carthage	+36% (over 1980)
Philadelphia	+120%
Sackett's Harbor	+62%
West Carthage	+44%
Gouverneur	+18%
LeRay	+40%
Watertown	+4,600 people
- o By 1989 the additional 174,000,000 in wages was 34% of the total wages for the area in 1984.

2/87

Section 8 income level increased by the State administering the HUD program to allow larger subsidy payments as rents increase.

2/8/87

A number of housing trends were observed: The number of housing units on the market was declining as the Army rents some and workers for the post moved into the area.

2/26/87

LUK finished 75 units of 801 housing in Copenhagen.

3/87

FDSC formed the North Country Affordable Housing Corporation, a non-for profit housing corporation, to provide low- and moderate-income housing.

3/12/87

WDC opened 30 units of 801 housing in Carthage. The remainder of the project would be finished by the summer of 1987.

3/16/87

WDC opened 10 units of 801 housing in Lowville. The remainder of the project would be finished by the summer of 1987.

3/21/87

The SC was told by the Army that announcements on the selection of contractors for an on-post lodging facility for temporary duty personnel and 1,200 residential units was expected within two weeks.

Since \$90 million had been allocated for the housing and the objective was to get as much housing as possible for the money, it was possible that the final number of units would vary with the bid chosen.

The hotel was expected to have 75 rooms with kitchenettes. The property would pay property taxes as the building would be built on land leased to a private operator.

3/87

Army Facility Housing (1150 units) contract award on-post housing.

3/21/87

The Mayor of Watertown was designated to represent the city on the SC Executive Committee (the city manager had been unable to attend SC meetings).

4/87

Drum facility construction award was made to National Structures; ground breaking in May.

4/87

Army physicians were credentialed in Watertown hospitals allowing them to have practice privileges in Watertown area hospitals.

4/87

Lewis County planning department was established and a director was hired. The staff indicated that three major trends in their county resulted from the Drum expansion: an increasingly severe housing displacement problem for low income residents of the county; a mini surge in some communities in the drafting of local growth control and planning regulations; and more and better county-state-federal dialogue than ever before.

Spring/87

Opening of DANC built sewer line.

5/7/87

Population Projections released by the Army are as follows:

	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89
Military	1200	3300	6400	9300	10600
Families	750	1900	3600	5200	6000
Family Members	2000	5000	9500	13800	15900
Civilians Employees	2250	2900	3300	3350	3400

Note: Columns should not be added to avoid double counting. See 10/86 for earlier figures that suggest a faster build up in troops and families.

5/87

300 additional units of 801 housing were contracted for with Gates-Rinaldi Corporation for the Town of LeRay. These would be completed by 8/88.

5/87

State Legislative granted award of \$60,000 to FDSC for emergency medical service training and \$60,000 to DANC for fire service equipment for communities.

5/87

The 700 units of housing now under construction on Fort Drum should be finished in '87 and '88. These units together with the 1,101 units that are contracted for FY 87 and the pre-existing housing would bring the total of on-post housing to 2,150.

5/87

Ground breaking for new Ft. Drum.

5/87

The adjusted demographics composition of soldiers was:

- 25.0% black
- 3.5% hispanic
- 4.8% women
- 5.1% other
- 61.6% caucasian

5/87

The expected increases in new students included:

- Carthage 1,000 new students
- Indian River over 1,900
- Watertown 630

6/87

Procurement conference held at Jefferson Community College to encourage local business involvement with Army construction and procurements -- sponsored by Congressman Martin.

7/87

Construction was completed at LUK - 801 Clayton site.

7/87

Construction was completed at LUK - 801 housing Philadelphia site.

Spring/87

\$517 million mega contract was awarded to Morrison Knudson.

7/11/87

Rental increases of \$60 to \$90 per month at two local housing projects built by Conifer Development drew the ire of the SC. The housing was built with Farmers Home Administration funding as affordable housing. Conifer indicated that it had Farmers Home Administration approval and based the rental increases on increases in taxes and other expenses.

8/87

Third and final RFP for 801 Housing leases were issued by Norfolk District Army Corporation of Engineers (300 units).

8/87

Local Highway Study began, financed by FDSC.

8/87

Second NY State Housing Finance Agency Housing Study began.

8/7/87

A report by the SC indicated that rents in the area had risen sharply since the Ft. Drum expansion was announced. A rental survey by the SC, that wasn't entirely scientific in its methodology, suggested that the average rent had risen by \$160. The percentage increases are 54% for 1 bedroom, 72% for 2 bedroom, and 38% for 3 bedroom.

The report concluded that the major housing needs of the area would be for more affordable apartments. There had been extensive activity in the construction of single family homes. At the time the market was satisfied and perhaps overbuilt as the number of market rate homes built was said to be enough to last the area through 1990.

8/14/87

LUK completed 164 of 224 units on Eastern Blvd. in Watertown, the remaining 60 units were expected to be finished by 11/87.

8/20/87

LUK had completed 68 of the 256 units on Arsenal Street in Watertown. The remaining units were scheduled to be finished by 12/87.

8/27/87

LUK had completed 120 of the 150 - 801 housing units in Philadelphia. The remaining 30 units were scheduled to be finished by October.

1987

Memorandum of agreement between Ft. Drum and civilian law enforcement agencies which delineates prospective responsibilities. Future coopertion, based on this agreement, made inter-agency law enforcement one of the major success stories of the buildup.

9/11/87

WDC had completed 400 units of 801 housing units at four sites: Carthage, West Carthage, Lowville, and Gouverneur.

9/30/87

Revised population projections were released by the Army as follows:

	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89
Military	1200	3300	6400	8200	10500
Families	150	1900	3600	5200	5950
Family Members	2000	5000	9500	13800	15800
Civilians Employees	2250	2900	3100	3400	3600

Note: Columns should not be added to avoid double counting. See 5/7/87 for earlier projections.

9/30/87

The Army had leased by this date 700 units of housing on a short-term basis because of delays in the 801 housing.

9/30/87

52 of 700 units of housing under construction on post were completed.

9/87

Estimates of area payroll resulting from the Fort were released:

FY 87	\$100 million
FY 88	160 million
FY 92	246 million
Actuals from	
FY 84	31 million
FY 85	44 million

9/87

As of that month, 3,063 off-post housing units had been added to the area since January of 1985. This included: 1,069 units of 801 housing, 258 units of Farmers Home Administration 575 units, 162 units of senior citizen housing, 182 apartments, 692 mobile or

modular homes, and 697 single family homes. Over 3,000 more units were needed by 1990.

Additional housing proposed included 931 units of 801 housing, 172 units of Farmers Home Administration units (of which an estimated 108 would be built), 300 units of senior housing (of which an estimated 108 would actually be built), 2,585 apartments (of which an estimated 176 would actually be built), 638 mobile homes or modulars (of which an estimated 206 would actually be built), and 3,758 single family homes (of which an estimated 131 would actually be built). Estimates are by the SC.

10/87

Construction was completed at LUK - 801 housing Arsenal Street (Watertown) site.

10/87

Construction was completed at LUK - 801 housing Gouverneur site.

10/87

Lieutenant Governor Lundine announced results of study of limited access highway between Ft. Drum and Route '81; study determines that highway was not needed.

10/13/87

Fort Drum began pumping its sewage through completed DANC pipeline to Watertown sewage plant.

10/87

Opening of dental clinic at Mercy Hospital.

11/87

Public Safety Master Plan Study began.

12/87

"Housing Demand/Needs Analysis of the Impact of Ft. Drum Expansion" a second study by the New York State Housing Finance Agency, Office of Housing and Technical Services was released.

12/87

Final 801 lease agreement signed between Army and WDC Gouverneur, Lowville, Carthage, and West Carthage.

12/87

First Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic (MAST) flight Controversy erupted over the fire safety standards governing hospital's Helipad.

12/30/87

LUK had completed 1,000 units of housing. 600 units were located at 3 sites in Watertown, and 400 units are located at four other sites: Clayton, Philadelphia, Copenhagen, and Gouverneur.

12/87

Pilot signed with Carthage.

12/87

Fist landing of CHAMPUS helicopter at Mercy Hospital under iterim agreement.

2/88

A project for 1,150 units of on-post housing got underway. Completion dates began in the summer of 1988 and end in January of 1990.

2/88

LUK signed final lease with Army for its 801 housing.

2/17/88

The demographic composition of the Ft. Drum Army personnel at the time included:

- 25.7% black
- 3.9% hispanic
- 5.3% other
- 5.7% women

This represented an increase in the percentage of women and blacks..

2/88

HUD Buffalo Regional office, in response to request by FDSC sent representatives to Watertown to assist municipalities in preparation of small cities Community Development Block Grant applications. Process resulted in several grant awards, and is repeated in 1989 and 1990.

2/17/88

Revised population projections were released by the Army are as follows:

	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90
Military	1200	3300	6050	8200	10500	10700
Families	750	1900	3600	5200	5950	5500
Fmly. Mmbrs.	2000	5000	9500	13800	15800	14600
Civ. Empl.	2250	2900	3100	3400	3600	N/A

Note: Columns do not add due to double counting; see also 9/30/87. Arrivals continue to be stretched out.

3/88

As of this month, units completed from January 1985 through this month total 4,727. Of this total, 1,700 units were 801 units, 258 were Farmers Home Administration 575 units, 165 senior citizen units, 530 apartments, 1091 mobile and modular units, and 983 single family homes.

Additional housing proposed includes: 300 more units of 801 housing, 184 Farmers Home Administration 575 housing (of which 138

were expected to be constructed), 176 senior citizen units (of which 128 were expected to be constructed), 1,996 apartments (of which 219 were expected to be constructed, 1,228 mobile and modular units (of which 203 were expected to be constructed, and 4,117 single family homes (of which 434 units were expected to be constructed).

5/88

Fort Drum Military growth estimates were:

	10th Division	All Military
FY 85	N/A	685
FY 86	666	1216
FY 87	2526	3236
FY 88	4918	6499
FY 89	6017	7539
FY 90*	7954	9810
FY 91	8066	10005
FY 92	8006	10005
FY 93	8679	10678

* Reflected decision to station Combat Aviation Brigade at GRIFfiss AFB in Rome, New York, for interim time period.

5/27/88

The Fourth and final 801 award was made to DOF. The Army and DOF signed a contract for the completion of 300 units of 801 housing off of U.S. 11 near the north entry road to Fort Drum.

6/27/88

North County Associates (Gates-Rinaldi) completed the final 150 of 300 units at the intersection of routes 11 and 342.

8/1/88

The 700 unit development of on-post housing was completed by Envirdom. First Army family housing contract. Completion of final units.

10/13/88

Population estimates at the time were as follows:

	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 92
Military	1200	3300	6050	8200	10500	10700
Families	750	1900	3200	4300	5400	5500
Fmly. Mmbrs.	2000	5000	8500	11400	14300	14600
Civ. Empl.	2250	2300	2860	2400	2800	3100

Note: Columns do not add due to double counting; see also 2/17/88 for previous estimates. Arrivals continue to be adjusted.

10/13/88

Fort Drum payroll estimates were:

FY 87	\$104.2 million
FY 88	153.0 million
FY 89	226.0 million

11/88

Local Government Study began to evaluate how local governments are organized and managed to deal with the larger populations and expanded issues brought about by the military expansion.

11/25/88

The first 232 units of a 1,150 unit on-post housing development were completed.

1988

Jefferson County developed emergency shelter program to accommodate displaced families and homeless individuals.

1988

Lewis County appointed full time County administrator.

Late 1988

Zogby poll began: multiple sponsors were found to support the conducting of four surveys of the region to monitor the result of the military expansion, and to provide a basis for making private sector marketing decisions. John Zogby Group of Utica was selected to do the polling.

1/89

The average sales price for a home in Jefferson and Lewis Counties was \$68,122 in 1988. This represented an increase of 86% over 1984.

1/6/89

The population estimates at the time by the Army were:

	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 92
Military	1200	3300	6050	7950	10500	10700
Families	750	1900	3200	4475	5400	5500
Fmly. Mmbrs.	2000	5000	8500	11850	14300	14600
Civ. Empl.	2250	2300	2350	2500	2800	3100

Note: Columns do not add due to double counting; see also 10/1/88 for most recent comparison. Some categories continue to experience delays.

2/89

Public Safety Master Plan completed (terminated with one section uncompleted).

3/89

Third NY State Housing Finance Agency Housing Study began.

7/11/89

The population estimates at the time by the Army were:

	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89	FY 92
Military	6050	7950	10431	10221
Families	3200	4475	5400	5500
Fmly. Mmbrs.	8500	11850	11847	11549
Civ. Empl.	2350	2500	3504	3700

Note: Columns do not add due to double counting; see also 1/6/89 for most recent comparison. The delays in military continue, but there is a significant increase in civilian employment.

7/89

Payroll estimates and historical adjustments at the time were:

FY 87	\$139.9 million
FY 88	\$173.5 million
FY 89	\$218.0 (E) million

12/89

Draft of local Highway Study delivered.

12/89

Local Government Study completed.

APPENDIX 2

The following pages describe the Steering Council task forces, their participants, stated objectives and accomplishments, as well as the Council staff officers, and members.

FORT DRUM STEERING COUNCIL

CHAIRMAN

CARY R. BRICK

VICE-CHAIRMEN

THOMAS MC CUE BETTY BRADLEY WESLEY EISENHAUER T. URLING WALKER

SECRETARY/TREASURER

JAMES WRIGHT

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

EDWARD COSMIC

JAMES COX *

STEPHEN HARTER

JOHN JOHNSON, JR.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

KARL AMYLON

BRUCE ARMSTRONG

JUDITH FOSTER

MARK FREEMAN

JANE JENKINS

DONALD JEWETT

THOMAS JEWETT

JOHN KIECHLE

LLOYD MOORE

JOHN MORGIA

EUGENE MUNROE

RICHARD NELLS

HERMAN ZAHN, JR.

FORMER MEMBERS

DONALD ALEXANDER

GORDON CEROW, JR.

PATRICK EVANS ***

W. DOUGLAS HOWLAND **

JAMES LEANA ***

JAMES MERRITT *

H. OTIS RADLEY **

CLIFFORD REINHARD *

KENNETH ROGERS

ROSEMARY SANFORD **

RONALD TRICKEY

NICHOLAS VISKOVICH **

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

GOVERNOR MARIO M. CUOMO

CONGRESSMAN DAVID O'B. MARTIN

SENATOR JOHN MC HUGH

ASSEMBLYMAN H. ROBERT NORTZ

ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN O'NEIL

MAJOR GENERAL PETER BOYLAN

DAVID HANNUM, OBSERVOR

* FORMER CHAIRMEN

** FORMER VICE-CHAIRMEN

*** FORMER SECRETARY-TREASURER

FORT DRUM STEERING COUNCIL

STAFF

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

TERRENCE L. ROCHE

1986 - 1990

DAVID HANNUM

1984 - 1986

ASSISTANT TO THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

JAMES ELLSWORTH

CHERYL SHENKLE

1988 - 1990

THOMAS SAUTER

1986 - 1988

PHILLIP COMPEAU

1987 - 1988

COMPUTER ANALYST

PENNY SWEREDOSKI

1986 - 1987

HEALTH/HUMAN SERVICES PLANNER

DEBORAH METZEL

1985 - 1986

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

KATHLEEN MASTELLON

1986 - 1989

SECRETARY/RECEPTIONIST

CINDY JENNE

1987 - 1990

ELLEN LARKINS

1985 - 1986

KIM SURACE MC CREARY

1985

ELIZABETH DESTEPHANO

1984 - 1985

AGRICULTURE TASK FORCE

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goal of the Agriculture Task Force is to ensure the harmonious integration of the North Country's leading industry, agriculture, with the Fort Drum expansion. The Task Force has been concerned that all land use decisions cause minimal impact to viable farm land and the agricultural practices of farm owners. The Task Force has further been concerned with the effects of speculative land purchases and development on supply of agricultural land and on the taxes levied against agricultural land. The Task Force has been committed to a goal of expanding the market potential for agricultural products in view of the Fort Drum expansion.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During the past five years, the Agriculture Task Force has:

- * Sponsored informational meetings for rural landowners on the topic "The Expansion of Fort Drum as it Relates to Agricultural Land Use"
- * Participated in the development of the "Regional Land Use Plan" prepared by the Black River-St. Lawrence Regional Planning Board
- * Sponsored a workshop on "Farm Product Marketing and the Fort Drum Expansion"
- * Developed and distributed a pamphlet "Selling to the Military--Big Rewards and Major Demands"

AGRICULTURE TASK FORCE

CHAired BY
PATRICIA SMITH
1985-1989

MEMBERS

Gerald Adams
Peter Farney
Melvin Klock
James Mc Mahon
Eugene Munroe
John Peck
James Seamans
Max Tessmer
David Timerman
William Walldroff

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The fundamental goal of the Economic Task Force is to provide technical assistance and direction to area businesses in order to optimize the economic benefits of the expansion and, in turn, create long-term local jobs. Our three main objectives are to: reduce long-term unemployment in the tri-county region; encourage business development opportunities in order to attract and retain younger and more entrepreneurial people, i.e. reverse the trend of out-migration of the "best and the brightest" from the North Country by providing new employment opportunities; encourage and assist with the revitalization of existing industries to prevent development of a "one company town" dependency on the military expansion at Fort Drum.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- * Creation of Small Business Development Center at Jefferson Community College with assistance from the New York State Small Business Administration and the State University of New York.
- * Assisted with planning and encouraged attendance at two regional Defense Procurement Conferences. (Potsdam and Watertown)
- * Researched the creation of a North Country Development Association similar to the Metropolitan Development Association of Syracuse.
- * Encouraged chief executive officers of the areas largest employers and executive officers of the leading banking institutions to serve as ambassadors for the North Country.
- * Supported the creation of the Development Authority of the North Country to serve as a lead agency in promotion of economic growth in the region.
- * Supported the activities of existing county economic development councils and encouraged formation of such councils where none currently exist.

**ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT
TASK FORCE**

CHAired BY

WILLIAM LEROY
1985

THOMAS HANLEY
1987

MEMBERS

Karl Amylon
Ralph Brouty
Larry Burnett
Anthony Costantino
Fred Eschelman
Patrick Evans
Andy Gray
Thomas Hanley
Leroy Hansen
Linda Hartz
Steven Hayes
James Kanik
Urban Karcher
Edmund Keane
Bill LeRoy
James Merritt
Steven Mitchell

Jack Nichols
Chris Papayanakous
Stephen Pascereetti
Michelle Pfaff
Homer Perkins
Robert Quinn
H. Otis Radley
Brent Richardson
Edmund Russell
Martin Schatz
Chris Schellhorn
Ronald Stanton
Jack Tanner
T. Urling Walker
Dr. David Walton
David Walton, Jr.
James Wears

George Woodruff

EDUCATION TASK FORCE

GOALS and OBJECTIVES

The mission of the Education Task Force is to facilitate comprehensive long and short range planning for local school districts for the delivery of quality educational opportunity to school-aged students and members of the community in the most equitable, economical, and efficient manner.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Education Task Force accomplished the following during the past five years:

- * Surveyed school districts on health services and need for in-service nurses training.
- * Presented workshops on multi-cultural awareness.
- * Developed funding proposals which secured \$9.6 million dollars in New York State Fort Drum impact aid for the affected school districts from 1986 to present.
- * Created orientation programs and packets of information for new students and parents.
- * Monitored monthly school enrollment figures and reported changes to the Steering Council.
- * Developed instructional units on Fort Drum and the Army.
- * Identified an English as a Second Language (ESL) Coordinator to serve the school districts.
- * Conducted visits to other impacted districts across the country.
- * Collected data on available school resources and projected annual district needs for facilities, staffing and programming.
- * Established school district boundaries on Fort Drum.
- * Hosted presentations by educators from other military impacted districts.
- * Acted as liaison with the State Education Department for individual district concerns in construction projects.
- * Supported development of the SUNY - Fort Drum - North Country Consortium of colleges.

EDUCATION TASK FORCE

CHAired BY
CHARLES BOHLEN, JR.
1985-1989

MEMBERS

DONALD ALEXANDER
CAMIE BAKER
JACK BOAK
BONNIE BETTINGER
DAVID BUSH
JANICE CHARLES
DR. HANS DELLITH
REV. LAWRENCE DENO
WALTER DOHERTY
ALSON DOUGHERTY
ELSTON ECKER
KENNETH EYSAMAN
WARREN FARGO
GEORGE FORBES
BRUCE FORNESS
DONALD GRANT
DAVID GROSS
HOWARD HALLOCK
VIRGINIA HARRINGTON
WILLIAM HART
HENRY HENDERSON
JOHN HENDERSON
ELIZABETH HESSLER
GARY JADWIN
INGRID JANSURE
CLEVELAND LANSING
WARREN LEIB
LAURA LEWIS

CAROL LIVELY
GARY MC DERMOTT
RONALD MC LENNAN
LEONARD MEINHOLD
PHYLLIS MURRAY
JACK MYLAN
FRANK O'CONNOR
BERNARD PERRY
JERALD QUIMBY
DR. BURTON RAMER
KENN RISHEL
CARL ROBBINS
DR. LAWSON RUTHERFORD
RUTH SALTER
SHARON SHERMAN
MICHAEL SMITH
SHEILA STEVENS
DAVID STONE
KENNETH SUTTON
ROBERT THOMAS
DONNA WAGONER
ROSE WILLIS
KAREN WOOD
WILLIAM WORMUTH
KEITH YANDOH
MICHAEL YOUNG
KAY ZEOSKY
HENRY ZYGADLO

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES TASK FORCE

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Employment (or Job) Opportunities Task Force was organized in 1987 to enhance the employment prospects of local residents through a coordinated, complementary referral mechanism. The members planned to utilize existing mechanisms in an effective manner to maximize the marketing of tri-county residents and to promote the availability of local sources.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- * Developed and distributed a brochure to promote local services such as Employment Training and Job Services and to encourage new, expanding and unfamiliar businesses to use the services of tri-county employment and training offices and economic development offices. More importantly, the brochure encouraged these businesses to hire tri-county residents.
- * Encouraged New York State Department of Labor officials to establish a tri-county employment network system which would facilitate the sharing of current job information.
- * Worked with the local New York State Employment Service Office to develop a transferable application system and an enhanced "coded" job match system to better respond to employer/employee needs. The local area computer network was expanded to ensure same day information posting of new employment opportunities and availability of new applicant resumes within the tri-county region. This enables St. Lawrence County and Lewis County residents to apply for Fort Drum or Fort Drum-related positions without traveling to Watertown or Fort Drum.
- * Developed and refined a reporting tool to monitor the effectiveness of the referral system which continues to be distributed monthly to members of the task force.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES TASK FORCE

CHAired BY

EDMUND RUSSELL
1987

MEMBERS

Martin Del Signore
Wally Dennis
Linda Eberhart
Raymond Fountain
Stephen Froum
Pat Gray
Tony Lawyer
C. Kevin Mc Donough
James McFaddin
Gary Mc Givney
Stephen Miller
Barry Tyner

HEALTH CARE TASK FORCE

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goal of the Health Care Task Force is to assess the impact of the expansion of Fort Drum on the area's health care system.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Three subcommittees of the Health Care Task Force were established to implement the goal of the task force: the Community Health Services Committee (CHSC), the Medical Subcommittee, and the Hospital Subcommittee. These subcommittees performed the following major tasks over the last five years:

- * Developed a complete census of area physicians and determined physician requirements by specialty to aid in determining recruitment goals. (Medical and Hospital Subcommittee)
- * Identified the requirements for hospital services to meet the needs of military health beneficiaries. (Hospital Subcommittee)
- * Conducted a provider survey of agencies in the tri-county impact area in order to identify services available, current funding resources and anticipated need. Results of this survey provided baseline health services information to plan for any community health services expansion. (CHSC)
- * Published the Tri-County Impact Area Community Health Services Directory. (CHSC)
- * Established working relationships with Fort Drum Community Health Services, local school health agencies, health care providers, planners and physicians. (CHSC)
- * Established a dental clinic at Mercy Hospital to meet the needs of those on Medicaid and others without regular dental care (Dental Health Subcommittee of the CHSC)
- * Assisted the U.S. Army with the establishment of the CHAMPUS Demonstration Project for Fort Drum personnel and their families. (Medical and Hospital Subcommittee)
- * Assisted hospitals in granting credentialing privileges for Army physicians to practice in local hospitals. (Medical and Hospital Subcommittee)
- * Developed an extensive Summary of Community Health Service Needs, Recommendations and Proposed Actions for the tri-county area. This summary was last updated in 1988. (CHSC)

HEALTH CARE TASK FORCE

CHAired BY
STANLEY DUNCAN
SR. RUTH SEGUIN

1985
PAUL S. CURTIS, M.D.
1985-1987
DANIEL WEBER, M.D.
1988-1989

COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES COMMITTEE
JANICE CHARLES
1985-1989

MEMBERS

ABERNATHY, DAVID	FISHER, ALAN *	PANUNZIO, ROSE *
ALEXANDER, DONALD +*	FRAZIER, PAULINE *	PHILLIPS, BRIAN *
ANDERSON, JANICE *	FREEDMAN, MICHAEL *	PETERSEN, FRANCINE *
ANDREJEWSKI, NORMAN +*	FREEMAN, LARRY +*	POULTON, CPT. MARK *
BEAVER, MARJORIE	FREY, JULIE	PUCCIA, PHILLIP *
BEHN, VIDA *	GIROLAMO, JANIE *	QUINTON, BYRON *
BILLOW, JEAN *	GUGENBERGER, ALBERT +*	REED, GERALD
BLANCHARD, MERRILL *	HALPIN, KIMBERLY *	RICE, DR. NICHOLAS *
BLENCO, DAVE *	HANES, DR. LEE *	ROCKHILL, BARBARA *
BOBO, TIMOTHY +*	HARRIS, SHARON *	ROBERTS, COL. DAVID
BOHLEN, CHARLES JR. *	HEADY, JEAN *	RYAN, SUSAN *
BOYBERGER, THOMAS +*	HESLER, ELIZABETH +*	SCHILLING, LEON *
BOYER, LUCIA *	WRIGHT, BRUCE	SCHWAB, COL. JAMES
BRADLEY, HON. BETTY	HOPPS, DEBORAH *	SCHRADER, JOHN *
BROWN, CHRIS *	YOUNG, ELOISE *	SHERMAN, DR. BARRY *
BROWN, MARSHA *	JAPRETT, WENDY *	SIEBER, EDWARD +*
CAEZZA, JOHN	JOHNSON, MAJ. JACKIE +*	SKINNER, GARY +*
CARLISLE, SHARON *	KARPINSKI, MARY *	STONE, DR. FRED *
CASHION, CAROLE *	KEHOE, F. JOSEPH	TAYLOR, FLO *
CASWELL, PAMELA *	KNOWLES, MARK +*	THOMAS, BRUCE *
GRAVETZ, MICHELLE *	LANKFORD, CPT. BILL *	TINGLEY, LARRY +*
DAVIDOFF, DONALD +*	LAUFIN, LORRAINE *	VALASCO, LTC. MAXIMO
DAWSON, JOANN	LAWLER, DR. CLAUD *	WALKER, ELIZABETH *
DAY, DANIEL *	MANGIN, DR. WILLIAM *	WALLIN, CARLA *
DE LARM, MICHAEL *	MC CARTHY, JAMES +*	WEAL, FRANCIS *
DE LUCCIA, DAN *	MC DOWELL, PHILLIP +*	WILLIS, ROSE *
DORR, BRENDA *	MC HUGH, SEN. JOHN *	WILSON, SHERRY, *
DROP, JEFFREY *	MC KINNON, GWEN +*	WILLAMAN, P. OWEN
DUIRE, DIANE *	MUNK, DAWN *	WING, BRIAN *
EATON, LTC. HAL	MURPHY, JOHN	
EIN, RONALD *	NAGY, LEWIS *	
FINCH, NEIL +*	NORTZ, H. ROBERT	
FINNERTY, DR. JAMES *	O'BRIEN, KATHERINE	

* Member Community Health Services Committee

+* Member Health Care & Community Health Services

HISTORY TASK FORCE

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The History Task Force was asked to develop a properly documented list of notable civilian and military personnel who either originated from Northern New York, or who had contributed to the military history of Northern New York.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- * Developed a list of appropriate names which was submitted to the installation commander at Fort Drum for use in naming of new buildings, streets and areas in the new cantonment area.

HISTORY TASK FORCE

CHAired BY

**RICHARD HALPIN
1985**

MEMBERS

**Robert Brennan
John Burdick
Jerry Hoard
Raymond Hull
James Jerome
Emerson Laughland
Randy McIntyre
Carolyn Perkins
Harold Sanderson
Edwin Stouffer
T. Urling Walker
Robert Watts
Patrick Wilder
Suzanne Wiley**

HOUSING TASK FORCE

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Housing Task Force was organized to equalize demand and supply in area housing by promoting new construction and renovation of existing units; monitor displacement, mobility, rent increases and other effects on lower income tenants; promote modest, affordable housing; and provide data pertaining to housing market and conditions.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- * Developed Housing Master Plan.
- * Requested Housing Market Analysis by New York State Housing Finance Agency.
- * Petitioned Federal and State governments for priority consideration to Impact Area.
- * Surveyed all impact area communities to determine housing needs, plans, capacity and interest in housing development.
- * Reviewed and endorsed land use policies developed by Fort Drum Land Use Team.
- * Promoted Shelter Allowance Increases.
- * Promoted raise in Section 8 income levels for low and very low income families.
- * Monitored housing construction, revaluation rates, displacement and housing waiting lists.

HOUSING TASK FORCE

CHAired BY

ANTHONY BOVA
KARL REUTLING
JOHN SNYDER
1985
ROBERT BASTIAN
1986

MEMBERS

ARCHER, YVONNE
BACON, DAVID
BARTON, CAROLYN
BASTIAN, ROBERT
BEASLEY, GARY
BONNEY, KRISTY
BOVA, ANTHONY
BOWERS, KENNETH
BROUTY, RALPH
BURNETT, LARRY
CARLISLE, KEVIN
CASEY, NANCY
CHEAL, JANE
COE, PEGGY
COSMIC, EDWARD
CULLEN, DONNA
DEUVAL, ERNEST
DOWD, JIM
GLEASON, DOUG
GROVER, JOHN
HAYES, STEVEN
HOFFMAN, JANET
JOHNSON, JOHN
KAMBIC, STEVE
KARCHER, URBAN
KEVLIN, MARY JOAN
KIECHLE, JOHN
LACY, WILLIAM
LA ROCK, JERRY
LIEBLER, ATTY. LEWIS
LIVELY, CAROL

LOVELESS, MARILYN
LOVERLING, LINDA
MC KEE, LT. DANIEL
MC KEE, PAMELIA
MERRITT, FRED
MONTEGELLI, MICHAEL
MORASCO, F. MICHAEL
NAVARRO, JACOB
NETTO, ALFRED
O'NEILL, CAROLYN
PARKER, THOMAS
POMEROY, DONALD
RATHBUN, DEBORAH
REINHARD, CLIFFORD
REUTLING, KARL
RIMA, PATRICIA
RIZZO, JOSEPH
ROBINSON, ELIZABETH
ROCKWOOD, WESLEY
SCHELLENG, DOUGLAS
SCHLICHTING, PETER
SHAPIRO, WILLIAM
SNYDER, JOHN
SOLAN, TERRY
SPILMAN, KORLEEN
TADDIKEN, NANCY
THESIER, WILBUR
VELTON, ALEX
WADE, CURRAN
WARD, THEODORE
WING, BRIAN
YOUNGS, LILA
ZAHN, HERMAN

801 HOUSING TASK FORCE

GOALS and OBJECTIVES

The goal of the 801 Housing Task force has been to integrate military families into communities within the impact area by providing communities with a fair and equitable revenue stream to finance public services and by providing new residents with the same level of services supplied to existing residents of community.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- * Assisted 8 communities and the school districts serving them in developing information on funding issues and helped to establish negotiating policies relating to Payment In Lieu of Tax (PILOT) agreements in each community.
- * Secured staff assistance and coordinated funding for helping communities negotiate PILOT agreements covering 12 801 Housing sites in the impact area.

801 HOUSING TASK FORCE

CHAired BY
WARREN KENNEHAN
STAFFED BY
DANIEL LEE WILLBANKS

MEMBERS

LAWSON RUTHERFORD
EDWARD COSMIC
ROBERT PURCELL
GARY JADWIN
GORDON CEROW
WAYNE HUNTRESS
HENRY ZYGADLO
JOHN KIECHLE
DONALD GETMWN
MARK FREEMAN
T. URLING WALKER
KARL AMYLON
WARREN FARGO
H. OTIS RADLEY
JAMES MERRITT
THOMAS FLYNN

RON GAINES
MICHAEL SMITH
LEWIS NICHOL
TOM YOUSEY
CLIFFORD REINHARD
WILLIAM WORMUTH
ARTHUR STANTON
AL LAWRENCE
CURRAN WADE
BONNIE BETTINGER
DONALD PECK
ROSEMARY SANFORD
MAJOR STEVE ROSS
STEVE MITCHELL
DAVID HANNUM
BRUCE ARMSTRONG
EDWARD WHITE

HUMAN SERVICES TASK FORCE

GOALS and OBJECTIVES

The goal of the Human Services Task Force is to determine existing and potential human service delivery problems within the Fort Drum Impact Area and to mitigate the impact on the affected agencies.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Human Services Task Force working through the subcommittees of Youth, Child Care, Housing, Information and Referral, Family Violence, Transient Management, and Crisis Intervention achieved several successes during the 1984 through 1989 period.

- * Developed a baseline inventory of human services in the impact area to determine which services would be impacted and identified categories of high priority needs.
- * Provided an opportunity for ongoing networking, information-sharing and education.
- * Facilitated the establishment of an information and referral system to provide information on human service agencies in the area. (I & R Subcommittee)
- * Developed a Transient Management plan and promoted the establishment of an after hours line for access to emergency food and shelter. (Transient Management)
- * In coordination with Fort Drum and the Jefferson County Council of Social Agencies, promoted Cultural Awareness Workshops to increase awareness and understanding of cultural differences.
- * Established a child care resource and referral system to increase the number of family day care providers by providing start-up funds and training. (Child Care)
- * Identified child abuse, child care and substance abuse as significant problems and recommended additional funding to address these needs. (Youth)
- * Completed a needs and gaps document which identified existing needs for human services and made recommendations for addressing those needs.
- * Facilitated expansion of the family counseling program to serve military and non-military families. (Crisis Intervention)
- * Documented need for emergency shelter program for displaced families. (Housing)

HUMAN SERVICES TASK FORCE

CHAired BY

PAMELA CASWELL
S. JEAN WAGONER
1985
JACKIE NICHOLS
1985-1988
MARY HAMPTON
1986
JERRY MOORE
1987-1988
LARRY TINGLEY
MARIE WHITE
1989

MEMBERS

ADINOLFI, DAVID
ALEXANDER, DEBRA
ALSHOUSE, JEAN *
ALTERI, KAY *
ASHLEY, MARY ANNE
BAKER, CAMIE
BAKER, KENNETH
BARBER, PAT
BATCHELOR, CAROL
BEASLEY, GARY
BOCCIOLATT, CARMEN
BOULTER, ANNE **
BOXBERGER, THOMAS *
BRINKLEY, JOLYNNE
BROWN, MARSHA *
CARTER, FRANCES
CARTWRIGHT, JOSEPH
CASHMAN, DONNA
CAVELLIER, DAWN
CHAPMAN, REV. BRUCE *
CHARLES, JANICE **
COE, PEGGY **
DAVIS, MARSHA **
DEAN, WARREN
DE LUCCIA, DAN
DONOHAY, BECKY
DORR, ROBERT
DOWD, JAMES **
EIN, FRAN
EIN, RONALD
ELMER, ELLISON *
FLACK, ROBERT
FORD, BRENDA
FREEDMAN, MICHAEL
FROUH, SHARON
GIROUX, DEBBIE
GLEASON, DOUGLAS

GRAUMAN, FRANCES
GRAVES, JAYN
GRYBOWSKI, MICHELLE
HAAS, CARLA **
HANNOTTE, CHRIS
HARACZKA, CHESTER,
HARRINGTON, VIRGINIA
HARVEY, MAJ. SHARON
HECK, MARJORIE
HINKLEY, PATRICIA **
HOFFMAN, JANET
HOKE, MAJ. MARY
HUNT, ELIZABETH
KIECHLE, JOHN
KITCHIN, DONALD
LA CLAIR, RALPH
LAMBERT, MARY
LANKFORD, CPT. WILLIAM
LEANA, JAMES
LIEBLER, LEWIS
LYMAN, STEVE
MAGEE, REV. MORTON
MAHABIR, ANSEL
MANGIN, DR. WILLIAM
MARSALA, EDITH
MC CLURE, KAY **
MC DOUGAL, ELIZABETH
MC KEE, LT. DAN & PAM
METZEL, DEBORAH
MISER, MARY
MOORE, ROSANN
MORENOS, RABBI JOSEPH *
MORGAN, MARY
MOSHIER, DORRANCE
NEARY, LORINDA
NELSON, TERRY
OLIVER, RICHARD

PALIEN, DORIS
PARRY, MARY
PEINKOFFER, ROBERT
PHELAN, PETER
POLOWCHENA, MICHAEL
PUGH, ELIZABETH
RAND, THEODORE
RATHBUN, DEBORAH
RICH, JOSEPH **
ROCKHILL, BARBARA *
SANFORD, RICHARD *
SCHILLING, LEON **
SCOPETTI, CYNTHIA
SEMIONE, JUDY
SHERMAN, SHARON BOTELLE
SIMMONS, REV. DAVID *
SYNNER, GARY
SLACK, BETTY
SLOANE, DEPUTY CHIEF
STAHL, CPT. KENNETH
STRASSER, ALLEN
TAYLOR, LORRAINE
THOMAS, ANNIS
THOMAS, BRUCE
TYRON, SGT. JIM *
WAGONER, MAUREEN **
WAGONER, S. JEAN
WALSH, SHIRLEY
WEISE, DENNIS
WEST, CAROL
WHELAN, TERRY
WHITE, MARIE
WILLIS, BARBARA
WILSON, ANNE
WING, BRIAN
WRIGHT, BRUCE
YOUNGS, LILA

* Transient Management Committee Member

** Human Services & Transient Committee Member

LAND USE TASK FORCE

GOALS and OBJECTIVES

The mission of the Land Use Task force has been to identify the impacts on land use occasioned by the Fort Drum expansion, and to assess the planning resources, data and staff required to respond to planning needs and technical assistance requests in the tri-county area.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- * Identified the shortfall in staff resources available within the impact area to meet community planning needs.
- * Helped form the Fort Drum Land Use Team, composed of representatives from the planning departments in Jefferson, Lewis and St. Lawrence counties, and with substantial participation from the Tug Hill Commission, the St. Lawrence-Eastern Ontario Commission, and the New York State Department of State. The members of the Land Use Team, working together and individually have provided greatly increased levels of planning services to communities throughout the impact area.
- * Assisted the Federal Office of Economic Adjustment in identifying and rating community capacity and in developing market factors for use in the Steering Council's Fiscal Impact Analysis, and in the population distribution model.
- * Formulated Regional Land Use Policies for adoption by the Steering Council.
- * Participated, with the New York State Urban Development Corporation, in developing a scope of services for a North Country Regional Development Plan.

LAND USE TASK FORCE

CHAired BY
EDWARD COSMIC
1985-1989

MEMBERS

ARMSTRONG, BRUCE
BLACKBURN, WARING
BOHLEN, CHARLES
BOXBERGER, THOMAS
BENNETT, FRANCIS
BROWER, ROBERT
CALLAHAN, JAMES
CANFIELD, DONALD
CHAMBERLAIN, WILLIAM
CULLIN, ROBERT JR.
CURTIS, WILLIAM
DUVAL, PAUL
EARL, HOMER
ESSER, ANTHONY
GREEN, JOHN
IRWIN, BRUCE
KARCHER, URBAN
KIECHLE, JOHN
KEVLIN, MARY JOAN
LIBBY, RALPH
MC HUGH, JOHN
MEAD, BERT
MOOERS, RICHARD
NAGY, LEWIS
O'NEILL, JUNE
PALM, DANIEL
PHILLIPS, H. DYER
REINHARD, CLIFFORD
ROBBINS, GARRY
SCARLETT, MARK
THAANUM, MEL
TOWNSEND, MICHAEL
VERLAQUE, MARY
WILDER, KEVIN

MODELING TASK FORCE

GOALS and OBJECTIVES

The goal of the Modeling Task Force is to analyze the regional demographic and fiscal growth effects on the impact area caused by the expansion of Fort Drum.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Modeling Task Force, working primarily from the Steering Council office, completed the following tasks:

- * Produced the Fiscal Impact Analysis as a tool to guide the communities in planning for and mitigating growth related problems.
- * Collected data on building permits and proposed housing construction to estimate population growth and continually updated those figures.
- * Developed individual fiscal impact spreadsheets for each jurisdiction as subsets of the tri-county Fiscal Impact Analysis.
- * Developed system for monitoring employment and construction activity to verify the projections in the FIA model.
- * Produced school district modules which projected new student population, revenues and expenses and per-student rates.

MODELING TASK FORCE

CHAired BY
FRED MENZ
1985-1987

MEMBERS

EVAN ANTONIO
BRUCE ARMSTRONG
LTC. WILLIAM AUBUCHON
CHARLES BOHLEN, JR.
ROBERT BRUGGER
KEVIN CARLISLE
BENJAMIN COE
LYLE EATON
LTC SAMUEL EMERSON
MARK FREEMAN
ERNEST HOLMES
MARY JOAN KEVLIN
MOLLY MC QUEEN
ANSEL MAHABIR
HELEN MAXWELL
RICHARD MOOERS
JOHN ORTEGO
STEWART SIMON
PENNY SWEREDOSKI
MEL THAANUM

PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The major goal of the Public Safety Task Force has been to identify potential public safety problems associated with the Fort Drum expansion and to seek solutions or mitigating strategies to reduce or eliminate public safety problems as they arise. A further objective of the task force has been to provide a forum for continuous liaison between all civilian and military public safety agencies within the impact area.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- * Organized and managed a comprehensive study of public safety service organizations including police, fire, emergency medical services, emergency management, and the district attorney, probation departments, and the court system.
- * Assisted in the negotiation of the Memorandum of Agreement setting out the terms for civilian and military law enforcement jurisdiction and cooperation.
- * Played the lead role with civilian and military organizations in creation of the Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic (MAST) program, which provides emergency medical helicopter transport from accident sites to appropriate regional hospitals.
- * Responded to the need of emergency medical services/rescue squads for additional training and equipment, initiating efforts that resulted in a \$60,000 state legislative grant.
- * Played a lead role in gathering program planning data on the E-911 emergency telephone system.

PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE

CHAired BY

SHERIFF ALFRED O'NEILL
1985

DEPUTY CHIEF DONALD PASTOR
1986

SHERIFF DONALD PETTIT
1986

CAROLYN BARTON O'NEILL
1987-1988

CHIEF MICHAEL HENNEGAN
1989

MEMBERS

ALEXANDER, DONALD
ALLEN, JOHN
AMBROSE, TIMOTHY
BAKER, KENNETH
BONNEY, DAVID
BURNS, LT. PETER
CALLEN, LTC. PAUL
CASCANETTE, CHIEF J.
CLARY, D.A. LEE
COBB, JOHN
DALTON, NORMAN
DAMON, CHIEF RONALD
FOX, THOMAS
FRANK, CHIEF VINCENT
GAINES, PATRICK
GARDNER, CHARLES
GRAVELLE, CHIEF JOSEPH
HARTER, STEVEN
HEITZMAN, GERALD
HUMISTON, THOMAS
JARVIS, DEPUTY GARY
KELSEY, WINFIELD
KNOWLES, MARK
KNOWLTON, SHERIFF KIETH
LAVERGHETTA, FRANK
MARTIN, SHERIFF FLOYD
MC CUE, ROBERT
MADILL, RICHARD

MANTLE, JOHN
MERRILL, NATHANIEL
MERRITT, JAMES
MICHAELSON, H.G.
MILES, GARY
MORROW, WILLIAM
NEWBERRY, SHERIFF DONALD
NUTTING, RAYMOND
PAYNE, DONALD
PETRIE, JOHN
PHELAN, PETER
PIKE, CHIEF JAMES
REYNOLDS, EDWARD
ROEDEL, ZONE SGT. G.A.
RYAN, LT. JAMES
SHELL, RANDY
SLOAN, DEP. CHIEF KENNET
STEVENSON, MAJ. WILLIAM
TAYLOR, JUSTIN
TRICKEY, RONALD
TUCKER, SHERMAN
TYO, LTC. JOSEPH
VER SCHNEIDER, PATRICK
VIDETTO, FRED
WRIGHT, BRUCE
WRIGHT, JAMES
WITHINGTON, DR. JAMES
WITTON, SGT. DAVID
YOUNG, CHIEF JOHN

SOLID WASTE

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Solid Waste Task Force was formed in December of 1984 to examine local solid waste disposal problems and to make recommendations for management strategies in response to both existing needs and the anticipated expansion in the region.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- * Studied the serious environmental, economic, and regulatory constraints facing municipal and private landfills in Jefferson and St. Lawrence Counties.
- * Commissioned two reports that examined the feasibility of various solid waste management alternatives that could serve the region, including Fort Drum.
- * After extensive study and deliberation, the Task Force concluded that a regional waste-to-energy project was the preferred alternative for managing the region's long term solid waste disposal needs.
- * Supported the creation of the Development Authority of the North Country which has assumed responsibility for the development of a viable solution to the problems of solid waste disposal.

SOLID WASTE TASK FORCE

CHAired BY
JOHN MORGIA
1984-1985

MEMBERS

Willard Abel
Thomas Bradley
Gary Buckingham
Jack Colvin
Edward Cobb, Jr.
Jim Corriveau
Edward Cosmic
James Elliott
LTC Archibold Gallup
Urban Karcher
Mary Joan Kevlin
Eugene Parker
Gary Pilon
Robert Rehley
Clifford Reinhard
Elizabeth Timerman
Sam Villanti
T. Urling Walker
Curt Williams

TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE

GOALS and OBJECTIVES

The Transportation Task Force has been assembled to assess the impact of the regional expansion on the available transportation systems of the tri-county area, formulate a programmed prioritized response and develop a strategy for implementation with supporting documentation. The change patterns studied include long and short term impacts of development as a result of the changed economy of the region. Responses may include maximizing the use and efficiency of existing networks through management innovations as well as constructing new facilities.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- * Identified the need, developed a request for proposals and managed a multi-year consultant study of local highway needs. (in progress)
- * Developed a proposal to create a limited access highway between Interstate 81 and Fort Drum.
- * Spearheaded the development of a study of mass transit needs and potential solutions in the tri-county area.
- * Assisted New York State Department of Transportation in prioritizing state highway improvement projects in the Fort Drum impact area.
- * Worked with the New York State Department of Transportation to gather data in support of a Metropolitan Planning Organization.

TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE

CHAired BY

JACK RICHTER
1985
GEORGE HOISTION
1986-1987
GARRY ROBBINS
1988-1989

MEMBERS

JENNIE ADSIT
PAUL ALFKE
ROBERT ARCHER
BRUCE ARMSTRONG
JAMES CARRIGAN
NICK CANALE
GEORGE COLVIN
JOHN COOK
ED COSMIC
JAMES COX
GARY DAHL
HUGH DE LONG
JOHN DORR
JACK DU COLON
ANDREW FIUMANO
JOHN GREEN
ROGER GUNN

EDWARD HOOSE
BRUCE IRWIN
JOHN KANE
MICHAEL KASKAN
MARY JOAN KEVLIN
JOHN KIECHLE
JAMES KRAKER
CHARLES LYMAN
KEN MIX
BERNARD ROSBROOK
PERRY SCHANTZ
DAVID SIA
MICHAEL SLIGAR
MARK TILLOTSON
MARY BURNS VERLAQUE
KEVIN WILDER